HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XLV OCTOBER, 1952 NUMBER 4

THE ROMAN ARMY AND THE ROMAN RELIGIOUS YEAR

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

MEMORIAE IMMORTALI
MICHAELIS IVANOVICH ROSTOVTZEFF
SACRVM

I	The Feriale Duranum	187
II	Festivals and the army	189
	(i) The keeping of holy days	189
	(ii) Planning for the army	192
III	Purpose of official policy	203
	(i) The meaning of Romanization	203
	(ii) Hellenistic intervention in religious matters	208
	Antiochus Epiphanes	209
	(iii) Official Roman intervention in religious matters	211
	(iv) Pagans and Christians in the Roman army	223
	(v) Conclusions on the Feriale Duranum	229
IV	Popular awareness of holy days	229
V	Emperors and gods	237
VI	Conclusions	241
APPENDIX	'Themes son of Mocimus, priest'	242

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/harvard-theological-review_1952-10_45_4

THE ROMAN ARMY AND THE ROMAN RELIGIOUS YEAR

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK
HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

I. THE FERIALE DURANUM

DURA-EUROPOS on the Euphrates has given us many surprises, and not the least of them was that from this outpost we should acquire a Feriale, or list of days with prescribed offerings, and that these holy days should be exclusively Roman, Imperial, or military. After preliminary publications by Rostovtzeff, under whose guidance the whole work has proceeded, the text was edited by Robert O. Fink, Allan S. Hoey and Walter F. Snyder with a commentary indispensable to students of Roman religion and Imperial history.[1]

The Feriale has been dated between 224/5 and 235, and with some probability in 225–7 A.D. and, thanks to skilful and patient reconstruction, is nearly complete for much of the year. It records official religious practice, almost certainly that of the *cohors XX Palmyrenorum*, an auxiliary unit stationed at Dura. The days observed are, as in other calendars, listed without differentiation but may be classified in three groups. First there are Imperial occasions — the *vota* of January 3; the *natales* of divus Iulius, of Imperial *divi* and *divae*, and of Germanicus, who was not officially

[1] Yale Classical Studies, VII (1940); I refer hereafter to the individual contributors by name and page. For instructive reviews, cf. St. Weinstock, J.R.S. XXXII (1942), 127ff.; L. R. Taylor, A.J.A. XLVI (1942), 310f.; A. A. Boyce, Cl. Phil. XXXVIII (1943), 64ff. (Note also her contribution, Am. J. Arch. LIII (1949), 337ff. on the Imperial acclamations of Septimius Severus).

My warmest thanks for generous aid are due to Martin Percival Charlesworth, by whose death scholarship and his friends have lost so much, and to Professors A. R. Bellinger, H. Bloch, A. E. R. Boak, Campbell Bonner, J. Carcopino, S. Dow, Charles F. Edson, Jr., W. S. Ferguson, J. F. Gilliam, A. H. M. Jones, L. R. Taylor, S. L. Wallace, C. Bradford Welles, John A. Wilson, and to Mr. Harold Mattingly and Mr. Colin H. Roberts. I am indebted to the Yale Department of Classics for the plate.

deified; [2] the *dies imperii* of Trajan, Antoninus, Aurelius and Verus, Septimius Severus, and Caracalla; and a group of days associated with Alexander Severus and his family. Secondly, there are certain ordinary public festivals — Kalendae Ianuariae (in a gap, but probable); [3] *natalis Martis patris Victoris*, March 1; Quinquatria, March 19–23; *natalis urbis Romae aeternae*, April 21; *circenses Martiales*, for Mars pater ultor, May 12; Vestalia, June 9; Neptunalia, July 23; *circenses salutares*, August 5; Saturnalia, December 17–23 (probably). Thirdly, we have three military celebrations — the day of *honesta missio*, January 7 (but the reconstruction has been doubted), and the two *Rosaliae signorum*, May 10 and 31.[4]

The first category is in no sense surprising though its details are significant; e.g. the survival of homage *memoriae Germanici Caesaris*, and, as Hoey remarks (185f.) the legitimization of the Severi by an emphasis on the *dies imperii* of chosen predecessors. In the third category the *Rosaliae* are novel, but it is not strange to find previously unknown celebrations of military occasions. The unexpected element lies in the second group, for it had been supposed that, apart from keeping the Saturnalia, the army did not celebrate any festivals of the Roman calendar. Instead of this we find a unit, which is not even legionary, commemorating a number of them. Among these *Natalis urbis* and *Kalendae Ianuariae* would not astonish us anywhere in the Empire, but the Vestalia and the remaining days were on the face of it specifically Roman festivals.

Hoey is clearly right in observing that the *feriae publicae* prescribed did not as a group have any inherent connection with the army and military life. But should we agree with him when he urges that there was an obligation on the army 'to carry out the

[2] *Supplicatio memoriae Germanici.* Ovid's *numine dexter ades* (Fasti I 6) is poetic phraseology with no bearing on the status, then or later, of Germanicus; for official action, cf. A. Minto-U. Coli, Notizie d. scavi, LXXII (1947), 51ff.

[3] Cf. Fink, Am. J. Arch. XLVIII (1944), 17ff; he points to App. B. C. V 136 as evidence for military observance of January 1 before the Principate; it was not an official *feria*.

[4] On January 7, cf. Weinstock, l. c. The apparent omission of the Volcanalia (p. 153 f.) is strange, (cf. n. 8). In the gap in col. III 3, there may have been some celebration on Sept. 13 for Iuppiter Optimus Maximus on the anniversary of the founding of the Capitoline temple.

official acts of homage to the state gods' (p. 173), and again when he sees in these institutions a sustained policy of Romanization and an attempt to keep the army and even such alien components of it as this auxiliary unit in step with tradition (p. 206ff.)?

Let us consider first the supposed obligation.

II. SELECTION OF FESTIVALS FOR ARMY

(i) The Keeping of Holy Days

Just what is involved in this? As Wissowa remarked,[5] *ferias observare* signifies abstention from ordinary occupations: *feriarum festorumque dierum ratio in liberis requietem litium habet et iurgiorum, in servis operum et laborum* (Cic. Leg. II 29). In this sense *ferias observare* was binding on all Romans in civil life. There were various exceptions, and since it was agreed that you were entitled to do anything the omission of which would be harmful, *quod praetermissum noceret*, there was an almost unlimited possibility of dispensation; but the principle was fixed and the obligation clear. There was, however, no general obligation to perform specific acts of worship on these occasions. Priestly officials in Rome must carry out prescribed rites, which fulfilled the human part of the bargain, and a man who inherited *sacra gentilicia* was under an obligation to take appropriate action on any *feriae privatae* which they entailed.

Farmers naturally observed the Feriae Sementivae, Compitalia, and occasions for *lustratio*, as well as any annual festival which had become customary on a particular estate. Otherwise the individual's obligation was just what it once was on the Sabbath,[6] to rest and not to worship. Positive participation in a festival by

[5] Religion u. Kultus d. Römer (ed. 2), 432 (cf. 398ff.); Warde Fowler, Roman Essays, 79ff.; K. Latte, Z. Sav. Stift. rom. Abt. LXVII (1950), 54f. and Proc. VII Congr. Hist. Rel. 120.

The penalty for noncompliance mentioned by Macrob. Sat. I 16.9 applied only to those who worked within sight of the *rex sacrorum* and *flamines*. The popular misuse of *nefastus* to mean 'unlucky' (Wissowa 443 n. 7: also Tac. Ann. XIV 12, to which Professor Bloch drew my attention) suggests that it was not a term as familiar to the public as *feria(e)*. *Dies fasti* and *nefasti* are spoken of primarily in relation to public affairs; in relation to private concerns, *feriae* and *dies festi* are used, as are also *dies religiosi, atri dies*.

[6] Cf. H. H. Rowley, Bull. J. Ryl. Libr. XXXIV (1951), 109ff.

presence (if in Rome) and by acts of worship may have been common, but it was voluntary.[7]

In war also there was a negative obligation — to abstain from taking the offensive on certain days. That these were not identical with the *dies nefasti* or days on which neither courts nor assemblies met (a category including other days as well as the older *feriae publicae*) is proved by an express quotation in Macrobius (Sat. I 16.27): *ad rem sane militarem nihil adtinere notat Varro, utrum fastus vel nefastus dies sit, sed ad solas hoc actiones respicere privatas.*

That Varro's statement does not simply describe contemporary neglect of tradition in this respect (like the disregard of *auspicia* etc., of which Cicero speaks, N.D. II 9) is shown by the list given by Macrobius a little earlier (I 16.16 ff.) of days which are not *proeliares*. These are the Latin Festival, the Saturnalia, the days on which *Mundus patet* (a sacred pit was open), and *atri dies*, that is the days following Kalends, Nones, and Ides. To the *feriae* included in this list should be added the Volcanalia, which was a somewhat uncanny occasion; Volcanus was probably a god of destruction by fire and heat, and the populace at large participated in the rite; [8] the statement of Festus p. 253 ed. Lindsay, *erant enim quaedam feriae publicae, quibus nefas fuit illud facere* (sc. *hostem bello lacessere* — in contrast to *dies proeliares*), may imply that there were others.[9] The only general restriction which *feriae* as a group set upon military activities was a ban on the levying of

[7] So Cato makes the *vilicus* responsible for the keeping of *feriae* but proceeds a little later to say *rem divinam nisi Compitalibus in compito aut in foco ne faciat* (De re rustica 5.1,3; cf. Fowler, op. cit., 62f.); the only other positive observance prescribed is that on Kalends, Nones, Ides and festivals the *vilica* is to wreath the hearth *per eosdemque dies Lari familiari pro copia supplicet* (143.2).

The public at Rome were specially asked and aided to participate in ceremonies such as *supplicationes* and the Secular Games, but there was normally (cf. n. 90) no compulsion (Wissowa in Pauly-Wissowa, IV A 943). For voluntary acts of piety on festival days cf. Martial XII 67.

[8] For the Saturnalia cf. Macrob. Sat. I 10.1. Hoey's evidence (166) about the Volcanalia refers to a reluctance to start fighting, not to the performance of ceremonies; on the character of the day cf. Wissowa in Roscher, Lex. VI 359 and H. J. Rose, J. Rom. St. XXIII (1933), 56ff. Dio Cass. LXXVIII 25.2 shows that the meaning of the day was familiar in 217; cf. DEO VOLK(C)ANO on coins of Valerian and Gallienus and n. 178.

[9] Serv. in Georg. I 270 *alii hoc secundum augurale ius dictum tradunt, quod etiam in bello observetur, ne novum negotium incipiatur*, as a generalization about festal days seems to go beyond the facts.

men for service; now this came before the *iusti dies*, (thirty days of grace left for the enemy to give satisfaction if he did not wish to face *bellum iustum*), and lay within the world of peace.[10]

As for *dies atri*, they were *religiosi* and not *nefasti*. On a *dies nefastus* the gods could receive worship, and the lawcourts were closed and the Comitia might not meet: on a *dies religiosus*, sacrifice was normally forbidden and, failing any specific decision of the *pontifices*, it was not illegal to hold assembly.[11] What is more, the *Mundus patet* ritual neither (like the cleansing of the temple of Vesta on June 15 until the process was completed) made its days *nefasti*, nor did it make them effectively *religiosi*; in fact sacrifice was offered to Luna on August 24, the *ludi plebei* were not interrupted by the opening of the pit on November 8, nor were later the *ludi* in honor of Divus Augustus and Fortuna redux by that on October 5.[12] In other words, military practice (we should perhaps say military theory) preserved an archaic scruple. Varro's statement is amply confirmed; the supposed luck of a day counted for much more than its character in priestly calendars.

On the other hand, there is no evidence which clearly suggests that a Republican army in the field performed any of the sacrifices or other rituals prescribed for stated days in the calendar.

[10] Macrob. I 16.19 (quoting Varro); I interpret *viros vocare* as L. Jan: on the days of grace cf. Mommsen, Staatsrecht, III 387. How unlucky the *dies Alliensis* was thought to be is shown by the indignant words of Tac. Hist. II 91; but it remained *comitialis* and we find two dedications (C.I.L. VI 163, Ann. épigr. 1927, no. 65) and one *missio honesta* (Ann. épigr. 1942/3, no. 83) falling on it.

[11] I take it that the days when the *ancilia*, or sacred shields, were 'set in motion' were for the army like *dies religiosi*. Polybius XXI 13.10 speaks of P. Scipio as delaying during them because he was a Salius (for a taboo affecting the commander alone, cf. Tac. Ann. I 62.3), but Livy's statement (XXXVII 33.6) is confirmed by Tac. Hist. I 89 and Suet. Oth. 8.3; cf. Kobbert, Pauly-Wissowa, I A 581.

For degrees of scrupulosity cf. Wissowa, Religion, 443 n. 8. Scipio is said to have overcome his brother's reluctance to attack on a later *dies religiosus* (Frontin. IV 7.30). Note Gell. IV 6.10 for the justification of religious action on an *ater dies* (on the principle discussed in Harv. Theol. Rev. XXXII, 1939, 83ff).

(Somewhat similar was the closing of temples on the anniversary of the death of Germanicus; Minto-Coli, cited n. 2.)

The official calendar shows a remarkable freedom from superstitious fear. For the Roman point of view cf. Rose, U. Cal. Publ. Class. Phil. XII (1941), 91 n. 7 (on the *dies Parentales*).

[12] Wissowa, Religion, 585, 591, 589; Mancini, Notizie, 1921, 110 (Aug. 24 marked *C[omitialis]*. It may well be that in fact the Comitia did not meet on such days. Cf. Fest. p. 144.29).

Why should it? Apart from agrarian rituals which the farmer must perform on his land, and family observances of the days belonging to the dead, the official rituals of the *feriae publicae* — as prescribed in the books of the pontiffs — were performed in Rome and Rome alone; Livy V 52.2 *non dies magis stati quam loca sunt in quibus fiant* represents the official and Augustan view.[13] Even without the indication afforded by Gelasius in Collectio Avellana (Corp. scr. eccl. lat. XXXV), 100.13, p. 457, 100.23, p. 461, we could not imagine an observance of the Lupercalia in any place other than Rome. The annual sacrifices and supplications prescribed by the Feriale Duranum were new and independent ceremonies, the *supplicationes* following a pattern established under Augustus for Imperial anniversaries; there was in a sense an analogy in what Cato's *vilica* was to do for the Lar familiaris on many occasions in the year (n. 7).

(ii) Planning for the Army

Military life in the Roman Republic had certain specific religious observances. There were divinatory proceedings carried out in virtue of the *auspicia* vested in the commander, purifications (*lustrationes*), special ceremonies on the crossing of rivers, the sacrificial burning of captured weapons, and the occasional old rites of *evocatio* and *devotio*. A commander offered sacrifices on various occasions, e.g. after a victory, and sometimes paid his respects to the deities of the land in which he found himself.[14] In this, as in the making of vows, he acted, like a householder, at his own discretion; the setting up of special altars for the purpose may seem a peculiar feature, but has parallels.[15]

In earlier times there had been no standing army and no institutionalized military life, though long foreign campaigns and in particular such an operation as the long siege of Numantia must have begun to foreshadow it. Rome depended on bodies of men

[13] Cf. I 20.5 *quibus hostiis, quibus diebus, ad quae templa sacra fierent*, and Athenae. 274A.

[14] Cf. W. Rist. Die Opfer d. röm. Heeres (Diss. Tüb. 1914, pub. 1920); Latte, Pauly-Wissowa, IX 1117; and for a *lustratio*, G. Macdonald, Roman Wall in Scotland (ed. 1934), 363f.

[15] So in the ritual of the Arval Brethren (C.I.L. VI 2107.8), of the *ludi saeculares* (Romanelli, Notizie, 1931, 343); for grass altars in private cultus cf. F. J. Dölger, Ant. u. Christ. VI (1950), 312f.

levied for particular emergencies. It was Marius who made of soldiering a professional career and who 'appears to have given the legion a kind of personality.'[16] The camp, wherever pitched, became a home, and its occupants celebrated the Saturnalia and January 1 (n.3) as a Roman householder would, by way of private if in fact corporate observance. Before Augustus, no one had occasion to plan for the camps in this or in any other respect — just as no one had felt the need to establish a public fire brigade for the city of Rome.

We may recall the fact that, according to the *lex coloniae Genetivae Iuliae*, a majority of the decuriones was to decide *quos et quot dies festos esse et quae sacra fieri publice placeat et quos ea sacra facere placeat*.[17] This is of particular interest, since *coloniae*, in the words of Aulus Gellius (XVI 13.8f.), *ex civitate quasi propagatae sunt et iura institutaque omnia populi Romani, non sui arbitrii, habent*, and appeared to be *quasi effigies parvae*. All the same, they were not required to copy its calendar of festivals; they needed a calendar, and so, with all their differences, did military units; but for the military units the calendar was naturally prescribed, while *coloniae* chose.

Hoey (p. 173) quotes me as saying that the Roman army was 'the Roman people acting in a military capacity'. I should now modify this and say that the military units, *exercitus* — the plural is common — were instrumentalities of the people rather than the people itself.[18] This is surely the meaning of the formula in the ritual of the Secular Games, *p(opulo) R(omano) Q(uiritium) legionibusque p(opuli) R(omani) Q(uiritium)*,[19] and, to quote unofficial language, such is the clear implication of Tacitus Ann. I 2 *nulla iam publica arma*. Further, the whole tradition of Roman

[16] F. E. Adcock, Roman Art of War, 20.

[17] Dessau, Inscr. lat. sel. 6087 § 64; these days were thereafter mandatory (ib. § 70f., *ludi* are prescribed as an obligation binding on magistrates, but times are not specified). The cult of the Capitoline deities may be assumed in all Capitolia; otherwise individual choice will have predominated.

Each local community could have its own celebrations, like that referred to by Horace, Carm. III 18.9.

[18] (I exclude the old use of *exercitus* to mean *comitia centuriata*). From the standpoint of sentiment, an army was Rome *in partibus*, and foreign potentates did homage before the standards; but what is said above represents the constitutional fact.

[19] C.I.L. VI 32329.11f.

religion, as crystallized in the conventional account of Numa's doings, implies that *sacra* belonged to the life of peace, as lived *domi*, and not to the life of war, as lived *militiae*; so in Livy I 32.5, which represents what the Augustan age thought, the rites of the *fetiales* are called *bellicae caerimoniae* and are contrasted with the *religiones* instituted by Numa in peace. Between the solemn declaration of hostilities by a *fetialis* and their termination lay a necessary (and *ex hypothesi* always justified) interruption of ordinary life for Rome's representatives in the field. The Empire brought a standing army and military establishments, many of which were in practice (though not in theory)[20] permanent.

At some time, accordingly, a selection of festivals was made for the troops, and it should be noted that the principle involved in the making of a selection has a parallel even in domestic life within Rome, in sumptuary legislation intended to discourage individuals from excessive expenditures. Various enactments, from the *lex Fannia* in 161 B.C. to the time of Augustus, specified festivals and other occasions on which a householder might spend for his table at a higher (but still prescribed) rate than on other days.[21] No religious observances were involved, but certain festivals stood out and were natural occasions for enjoyment.

The rustic *menologia*[22] also show a selection which had taken shape — with no more emphasis on festivals connected with agriculture than the Feriale Duranum gives to festivals connected with war, and with a conspicuous absence of celebrations of Imperial anniversaries; this suggests that, in spite of the presence of the Lavatio (of Cybele) and of festivals of Isis and Sarapis, the menologia essentially follow a pattern which antedates the Principate. Columella XI 1.19 may serve to remind us that holidays were necessary on a farm.

What was to be done at military headquarters could hardly be left to individual initiative but needed to be given shape. For military purposes it was necessary also to specify what the observance should be, whether *immolatio* or the convenient *supplicatio*. Inci-

[20] Cf. O. Bohn, Germania, X (1926), 25ff.

[21] For references, see Kübler in Pauly-Wissowa, IV A. 905ff.; W. Kroll, Kultur d. ciceronischen Zeit, II 70; cf. the personal choice of celebrations ascribed to Severus Alexander in S.H.A. Alex. Sev. 37.6.

[22] Cf. Hoey 167.

dentally, expense was involved — a consideration which must have counted even before the economic stringency of the second half of the third century; and to offer (as did Julian) excessive sacrifices meant feeding the troops too well.[23] Moderation in offerings implied no lack of piety; Horace Odes III 23, for all its literary background, presumably expresses sentiments which Augustus would not have found improper.[24]

A hint as to how things may have happened is given by a phrase of Vegetius I 8, used of *disciplina militaris* in general: *quae Augusti et Traiani Hadrianique constitutionibus cauta sunt.* As in financial administration (above all for Egypt), so here also Augustus probably created a pattern for the legions which was retained in essence, extended to the *auxilia* and modified from time to time.[25]

The supposition that Augustus created a military calendar of religious observances would be fully consonant with his whole policy of establishing a decent Roman order in which each part of society had its function, status and duties. The old virtues must be restored; one of them was piety, on the exercise of which the peculiar greatness of Rome was held to rest. So Augustus ordained that each senator should make an offering of incense and wine before taking his seat at meetings.[26] The personal loyalty of the armies to their supreme commander was indispensable but was not enough. His soldiers would do their part the better if they worshipped the gods, and their work of guarding the Roman peace would be the more effective for being hallowed. Horace's words (C. III 6.7ff.)

[23] Amm. Marc. XXII, 12.6; cf. XXV 4.17 and the apologetic remarks of Liban. Orat. XVIII 170.

[24] Cf. Cic. Leg. II 25 and later Carm. lat. epigr. 873.

[25] Charlesworth kindly drew my attention to a striking instance of how Augustus thought about military administration, the quotation in Dig. XLIX 16.12.1, and to E. Albertini's discussion thereof in Rev. ét. anc. XLII (1940), 379ff. (A. concludes that it comes from a letter to Tiberius.)

C.I.L. XIII 11831 gives a fragment of an ordinance by a later Emperor, possibly, as v. Domaszewski suggested, Septimius Severus, referring to [*discipli*]*nam castrorum*; there is something about the standards and possibly something also about the guarding of the military gods. The text is too fragmentary to prove more than that the supreme authority continued to care about the detail of military arrangements.

[26] Suet. Aug. 35.3.

Di multa neglecti dederunt
Hesperiae mala luctuosae.
iam bis Monaeses et Pacori manus
non auspicatos contudit impetus

may well have meant more to Augustus than to Horace, and perhaps more to Horace than we are inclined to think. It was certainly in accordance with the wishes of Augustus that the *lituus* and other priestly insignia took so prominent a place on coinage, and that Augustus was at times here and in sculpture represented as performing the offices of religion.[27] The Ara Pacis is a worthy pendant to the Aeneid.

It would be foolish to seek a simple explanation of the actions of any man, above all of Augustus: there was undeniably something to gain by appearing in the guise of consecration rather than in that of sheer force, and a pragmatic view, such as Polybius had expressed, of the social utility of religion at Rome may have carried a certain weight. Nevertheless, it is hardly reasonable to suppose that the worship of the gods was maintained for centuries as a costly pretence.[28] I do not think that Augustus would have echoed Ovid's words (Ars amat. I 637), *expedit esse deos et, ut expedit, esse putemus*; and, since he was not a Greek, they may have shocked him. He would have been more likely to agree with Cicero (Leg. II 16) that belief is true and also useful. Be it added that Augustus, careful as he was not to tread the perilous path of Julius, took seriously the appearance of the timely *sidus*[29] and

[27] Cf. C. T. Seltman, Camb. Anc. Hist. Vol. Plates IV 148b, 146c. Sulla had used the *lituus* on coinage earlier (B.M.C.R. Rep. II 459); there may be a suggestion of divinely guaranteed luck. In general cf. M. Grant, Aspects of the Principate of Tiberius (Num. Notes and Monographs, CXVI, 1950), 45.

[28] Varro spoke of the gods as not wanting or asking for sacrifice (Ant. div., ed. Agahd [Fleck. Jahrb. Suppl. XXIV], 155) but he also said *et religiones et castus id possunt, ut ex periculo nos eripiant nostro* (ib. 156). For a possible reflection of Augustan piety in an ex-soldier's inscription cf. Wilhelm, Anz. Wien, 1948, 325f. Cf. again M. Aurel. I 17 (the more important in view of the remarks about superstition in I 16) and W. Kroll's magnificent discussion in Pauly-Wissowa, XXI 412ff. of the attitude of the elder Pliny, which is so easy to misunderstand.

[29] Plin. N.H. II 94; does *seque in eo nasci* refer to the fact that Octavian was starting a new life as an adopted Caesar?

This did not prevent a hostile attitude being taken towards the memory of some of the actions of Julius; cf. R. Syme, A Roman Post-Mortem (with the review of A. F. Giles, J. Rom. St. XLI, 1951, 161), and the verdict of Suet. Iul. 76 that he was *iure caesus* for his acceptance of overweening honors (cf. Flor. II 13.91).

PLATE I

appreciated his position, as *Divi filius*, more than man if, while on earth, less than god; for all his caution, he established the altars of Roma and himself at Lyons and in Germany and he instituted the *seviri Augustales*. The basic character of the Feriale, as concerned with gods and with rulers, fits all that we know of him.

Vegetius (p. 195 above) named two other emperors, Trajan and Hadrian. Trajan was a great fighting general and Hadrian was preeminent in firsthand knowledge of military life throughout the Empire. We may recall his coin issues, bearing EXERC(itus) BRITANNICVS, DACICVS etc. (with representations of him addressing the soldiers: cf. p. 207 later). Dio Cassius LXIX 9 speaks of his regulations as remaining in force; in view of what was said earlier about the necessity of restricting holidays, it may be added that Hadrian was concerned to check luxury in the army.

Now the celebration in the Feriale of *Natalis urbis Romae aeternae* certainly points to Hadrian; it is indeed true that April 21 had earlier been regarded as the birthday of Rome and just possible that the Parilia, the old festival belonging to that day, had in its own rights a place in the Feriale,[30] but it is more likely that Hadrian inserted it. Otherwise, apart from Imperial anniversaries and the observance of January 7 as the day of *honesta missio*, there is nothing which suggests a time later than that of Augustus, and the emphasis on Mars ultor,[31] like the *Natalis divi Iuli*, points clearly to Augustus.

Astonishment has been expressed at the absence of Cybele, Isis, etc.[32] It is perhaps more remarkable that Apollo, as patron of

[30] So the observance of March 1 perhaps acquired a special character (Fink, 82ff. St. Weinstock, J. Rom. St. XXXVIII, 1948, 37f.; Cat. codd. astrol. gr. IX i, 128, 131).

[31] As for the question (Hoey 124f.) why the games of May 12 were commemorated rather than those of August 1, the explanation may be that they had probably been established earlier (in 20 B.C.) and that they may very well have been specially associated with the recovery of the standards captured by the Parthians. It is just possible that the pattern of the Feriale was created between 20 B.C. and 2 B.C., to which year the games of August 1 are ascribed; any time in or soon after 12 B.C. when Augustus became Pontifex Maximus, would be likely.

[32] To be sure, Cybele is absent from lead tesserae, on which Sarapis appears four times, Isis once; but Juppiter appears only four times and Mars once (Rostowzew, Römische Bleitesserae, [Klio, Beih. III] 110), and I do not know what significance to attach to this. Neither Cybele nor the Egyptian deities appear in the dedications of *iuvenes* (S. L. Mohler, Trans. Am. Philol. Ass. LXVIII, 1937, 472f.).

It was festivals, not deities, that were commemorated; Mithras had none, save

Augustus, is apparently also unrepresented; I say 'apparently,' for it is just possible that among the data for October lost through the mutilation of the papyrus was a celebration on October 9, the day of dedication of Apollo's temple on the Palatine.[33]

In general the Feriale represents a selection from established festivals, as they were set forth in the calendars which were multiplied during the Julio-Claudian age. Cybele as Mater Deum had her place in these as in the Fasti found at Antium, which antedate the Julian reform of the calendar: [34] since 191 B.C. she had her temple on the Palatine and her *ludi*, marked by considerable pomp; by the time of Augustus she probably had also the dramatic ceremonial of the *Lavatio*. Her omission from the original list can hardly have been due to any feeling that she was in a sense alien; from the beginning, aristocratic dining clubs met on the first day of her games and Augustan poetry shows how closely she was linked to Rome's supposed Trojan origin. But she was omitted; this set a precedent and if, as I believe, it was an Augustan precedent, it was bound to carry great weight. Deified emperors had to be added; otherwise free expansion of the list could not be contemplated and there would perhaps have been some feeling against substituting new festivals for any already in the list. (It is of course likely that, after the time of our Feriale, Aurelian added *Natalis Solis invicti*, for Sol certainly took his place among the gods specially associated with the army).[35]

The absence of a festival from the list is therefore no sign of antipathy or disapproval; Isis, who, though eagerly worshipped and officially received at Rome, never acquired *droit de cité* in quite the same way as Cybele, gave her name to a ship in the

the Mithrakana in Asia Minor, and, as far as we know, Dolichenus had none; and so, quite apart from the fact that their cults were not taken into the official circle, there was nothing to celebrate.

[33] It is not surprising that there was no celebration connected with the *ludi Apollinares*, July 6–13, for the only *ludi* commemorated are those of Mars ultor and of Salus. For the first there was a special reason (n. 31) and the second fell on the *natalis Salutis* (Cic. Ad Att. IV i. 4 and Sest. 131 show that this was a familiar occasion. Further, Salus had a lucky sound and Augustus restored the *augurium Salutis*.)

[34] Wissowa, Hermes LVIII (1923) 383.

[35] For feeling against the neglect of established rites in favor of new ones, Professor Dow quotes Lys. XXX 17ff. For Sol, cf. Hoey, Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc. LXX (1939), 479f.; Nock, J. Rom. St. XXXVII (1947), 113; Fr. Altheim, Niedergang II 347 (on the possible addition by Aurelian of solar symbols to military insignia).

fleet.[36] Hoey has rightly reminded us that the cult of deities not included in the Feriale was not discouraged in the army — far from it; commanding officers and their subordinates often participated in the building of shrines and the making of dedications to such figures.[37] At Dura itself we have in the temple of Bel a remarkable painting of the tribune Terentius and his standard and standard-bearer, with two rows of members of this *cohors XX Palmyrenorum* (the unit which almost certainly had the *Feriale*), making an offering to three Palmyrene gods.[38] Since the standard is set immediately behind the incense-altar, Cumont inferred that it is to be thought of as sharing in the act of worship; we should, I think, prefer to suppose that what is signified is rather that Terentius is present in his official capacity, invested with all the majesty of Rome.[39] One of the soldiers in the upper row of those attending him is named as 'Themes the son of Mocimus, priest'. To sum up a discussion printed as an Appendix (p. 242 ff.), I regard Themes as, so to speak, the sacristan of the shrine in which the cohort's standards were kept. For our present purpose, the point of importance is that the tribune himself was performing the act of worship, with all the solemnity which could have accompanied any cult act prescribed in the Feriale; he may well have himself assumed the cost of making this pictorial record. Further, we are perhaps meant to think that his soldiers in general were attending him on this occasion; the two groups of figures behind him correspond to the four columns of Israelites in the Exodus scene as depicted in the synagogue at Dura.[40] Elsewhere at Dura there has been found a graffito showing an officer offering incense to Jahribol and a standard-bearer (without standard) doing like-

[36] R. Bartoccini in De Ruggiero, Diz. epigr. IV 91.

[37] Hoey, l. c. 456ff.

[38] F. Cumont, Fouilles de Doura-Europos, 89ff. pl. L; Rostovtzeff, History of the Ancient World, II 316 pl. LXXXII: pl. I here. On the standard bearer, cf. Rostovtzeff, J. Rom. St. XXXII (1942) 93.

[39] So also I suspect that the Tyche of Dura and the Tyche of Palmyra, as represented in the scene, are symbolic of the garrison town and of the nominal mother city of the troops and are not receiving a share in the act of worship; this is not as clear as it would be if they were facing one another, like the two Tychai in B.M.C. Galatia, 119 no. 31, but that would not have been compatible with the stylistic principle of frontality.

[40] Dura-Europos, Rep. VI 345. Cf. Numbers 2.3ff. and Origen, In Num. IV 2 (G.C.S. XXX 21).

wise at another *thymiaterion*: it is possible that this involved a courtesy to the distinguished Palmyrene (perhaps Odenath) who is represented as arriving on horseback.[41]

To be sure, the worship of Palmyrene deities by a *cohors Palmyrenorum* may be regarded as performed 'sémi-officiellement,' to use Rostovtzeff's phrase.[42] It is accordingly even more significant for the interpretation of official policy to find as the watchword at Dura for one day *Iuppiter Dolichenus s(anctus?)*.[43] This was a matter of formal action, formally recorded, yet Dolichenus was a deity who was never received among the Roman gods.

Hoey has indeed observed that dedications to non-Roman gods are apparently not found inside an actual camp-area. The archaeological evidence is hard to interpret, for we lack exact information as to where many of the relevant inscriptions were found. Insofar as Hoey's conclusion is warranted, it does not mean that there was any feeling that such deities were not appropriate objects of worship within the precincts of the camp. An ancient normally set up a dedication either in a temple, or on his own property,[44] or (with the permission of the civic authorities) on some public site.[45] Now inside the camp proper there were probably as a rule no sanctuaries save the little shrine of the standards, in which would be also representations of the Emperor and, no doubt, sometimes, of the *di militares*. I say 'as a rule,' because there were exceptional situations.

Such existed at Corbridge (p. 202 later), which was a depot rather than a camp, at Dura, where the soldiers were housed within an old residential area, and where various shrines are thought to have been inside the military precinct,[46] and at Castellum Dimmidi, which was of

[41] Rostovtzeff, Berytus, VIII (1943), 58f.

[42] Renaissance I (1943), 57.

[43] J. F. Gilliam, Yale Classical Studies, XI (1950), 216, 218.

[44] Cf. W. W. Fowler, Roman Essays, 75ff.

[45] So C.I.L. II 3228, VIII 6041, X 3822.

[46] E.g. the temple of Iuppiter Dolichenus, Kyria and a Syrian Baal identified with Zeus Helios Mithras (Du Mesnil du Buisson, C. R. Acad. Inscr. 1936, 144; H. N. Porter, Am. J. Phil. LXIX, 1948, 27ff.). Although the third god is called Zeus Helios Mithras Tourmasgade, I agree with St. Wikander, Etudes sur les mystères de Mithras, I (Vetenskaps-Societetens Lund, Årsbok, 1950), 27 that this is not Mithraism in the accepted sense of the word. We do not know who was worshipped in the shrine described in Dura-Europos, Rep. II 83ff., apparently on the Campus; possibly Disciplina, possibly Virtus or some Genius. [On the first

necessity a self-contained entity and which was moreover the shortlived product of an era in which soldiers were given a freer rein.[47]

So also the *equites singulares* at Rome made dedications which include a variety of deities, apparently within the camp proper; [48] but this was a matter of adding other divine names to the traditional Capitoline triad. Further, in later times at least, *scholae*, which were in effect clubrooms for noncommissioned officers of various ranks, acquired altars and these were no doubt largely set up as acts of devotion which did not involve a continuing cultus but some were perhaps used for subsequent offerings of incense and wine.[49] Such altars may sometimes have been erected elsewhere within camp limits.

Yet, in general, the only dedications (naturally requiring official permission) for which a camp was a natural place were those to the emperors, to the gods specially worshipped by the unit as a unit, and to the Genius of this or that subdivision of it. Again, there could be no question of dedications *in solo privato*, for a soldier owned no land within the camp and was ordinarily forbidden to acquire it in the province in which he was serving.[50] Accordingly the natural place for dedications to gods outside the official list was in shrines erected in the area beyond camp limits,

---

temple, or cult-complex, cf. now J. F. Gilliam, Dura-Europos, IX iii 115ff.: ib. 130, he places it on the edge of the camp.]

[47] G. C. Picard, Castellum Dimmidi, with the reviews by P. Grimal, Rev. ét. anc. LI (1949), 177ff., R. L. Scranton, Am. J. Arch. LIII (1949), 416f., H. G. Pflaum, J. Sav. 1949, 55ff., R. Lantier, Rev. arch. 1951, i 104f., R. Bloch, Rev. phil. LXXVII (1951), 122ff. This Castellum included a stele with the crescent of Caelestis, a shrine of the Palmyrene deities, and a Dolichenus stele.

[48] Corp. inscr. Lat. VI 31138ff.; cf. ib. 414 for a shrine of Dolichenus in the *statio* of *cohors II vigilum*, but these men, though having a quasi-military life, were not regular soldiers.

[49] On *scholae* cf. Cagnat, Mém. acad. inscr. XXXVIII (1909), 249ff., etc. and L'armée romaine d'Afrique (éd. 2), 386ff.; to call them 'chapels' seems to me unwarranted. — A. v. Domaszewski, Westd. Z. XIV (1895), 80 argues that one dedication to Silvanus was set up within a camp, and since the dedicators were the centurions of the legion (Dessau 2451) this is possible. Cf. Cumont, Et. syr. 163 on an ambiguous *Silvanus castrensis*. An *Aesculapius castrensis* at Rome (C.I.L. VI 15) may belong to the praetorians (cf. ib. 20).

[50] Dig. XLIX 16.9.13. When soldiers were permitted to lease portions of the *territorium legionis* (Liebenam, Pauly-Wissowa, VI 1677), they may well have set up dedications and private altars there. So at all times they may have owned small statuettes of the type discussed J. Rom. St. XXXVII (1947), 112; I so interpret the *signa deorum argentea castrensia* of C.I.L. XII 3058; since these had been kept at home and were apparently being given to a temple, they can hardly have belonged to a military shrine. On small statuettes cf. also Toynbee, J. Rom. St. XLI (1951), 171f.

where lived not only those who ministered to its various needs but also ex-servicemen.

In such areas, at Lambaesis and elsewhere, commanders erected temples freely to gods inside and outside the official list and these temples served both the troops and the dwellers in the settlement. Military architects were available, and generals might, like local magistrates and benefactors, take a certain pleasure in leaving monumental records of themselves.[51]

The Feriale therefore represents the worships carried on at the headquarters of an unit, which might be said to correspond to a *Capitolium*; there was no discouragement of the private pursuit of other worships, any more than there was of the supplementing of regular rations (for which the troops paid) by other forms of food.

Certainly the Feriale bears no special relation to local conditions at Dura and cannot have been made for Dura. The view of the editors that it is a transcript of general military practice, both legionary and auxiliary, can perhaps be supported by evidence from Roman Britain. L. P. Wenham has shown that the commander of an auxiliary unit at Maryport made an official annual dedication to Iuppiter Optimus Maximus, which might well be related to the Vota of the calendar.[52] Again, I. A. Richmond's brilliant interpretation of the roses, rose-leaves and rosebud-chaplet in the decoration of pilasters flanking a *vexillum* on a sculptured relief at Corbridge makes it very likely that the Rosaliae signorum was observed here also. Richmond has also made a case for an interest being shown here in the beginnings of Rome, and perhaps in their story as told by Virgil, which may hang together with the observance of *Natalis urbis Romae*. The whole article on the cults of Corbridge gives eloquent testimony to the fruitfulness of this Yale volume as 'an indispensable basis for all future studies of Roman military religion.'[53]

[51] M. Durry, Les cohortes prétoriennes, 115. The commander's wife might take a part (cf. C.I.L. VIII 2630); for her place in the scheme of things, see Tac. Ann. III 33–4 and R. Dussaud, C.R.A.I. 1937, 385.

[52] Trans. Cumberland and Westmoreland Antiq. and Arch. Soc. N.S. XXXIX (1939), 19ff.

G. C. Picard, op. cit. (n. 47) discusses dedications of an *ara cerei* on May 3.

[53] Arch. Ael. IV, xxi (1943), 162ff., 173ff., 149 n. 34; ib. 176ff. we have perhaps an echo of the cult of Mars ultor. Cf. W. Kubitschek-S. Frankfurter, Führer durch Carnuntum (ed. 6), 45 fig. 21, for a relief of Neptune being crowned by Victory; is this perhaps to be connected with the observance of the Neptunalia?

III. THE PURPOSE OF OFFICIAL POLICY

We have, therefore, a selection of festivals. The object of the celebration of Imperial anniversaries is clear: sacrifices meant free distribution of meat and presumably of wine [54] and *supplicationes* may have involved some liberality to the troops.[55] Obviously it was a good thing that enjoyment should be associated with loyalty. But what are we to make of the other celebrations? Did their observance involve a deliberate purpose of Romanization, or was it rather a matter of establishing and retaining a decent and uniform order?

I have tried earlier (p. 195) to state what Augustus may be supposed to have had in mind in establishing (as I think he did) a military calendar of festivals, which (except for the addition of new Imperial anniversaries) probably underwent little change. Any attempt to infer what his successors intended is in danger of resulting in too definite and specific a formula. By way of approach we shall consider first Romanization in general and the limits within which it may be regarded as deliberate; second, Hellenistic intervention in religious matter; third, the interference of the Roman state in the religious behavior of individuals and groups; fourth, the attitude of the military during the conflict between Christianity and paganism. On the last point we shall be largely concerned with a period later than the Feriale, and one in which a markedly different army faced markedly different conditions; but there was continuity enough to make this sequel instructive for our present purpose.

(i) The Meaning of Romanization

Romans and others were alike aware of the range and significance of Rome's policy in opening her citizenship ever wider and of the difference between her practice and that of classical Greece. But what is called Romanization is commonly, as A. N. Sherwin-

[54] Cf. n. 23 above and Joseph. B. J. VII 16.

[55] So L. R. Taylor, Am. J. Arch. XLVI (1942), 311. Cf. Liv. X 23.1 for the distribution of wine and incense to the Roman people on the occasion of a *supplicatio*; Plut. Brut. 39 for gifts to the soldiers on the occasion of a *lustratio*; n. 23 for Julian's sacrifices. Yet Asterius speaks of the celebration of Jan. 1 as costing the soldiers money (P.G. XL 221).

White has said,[56] self-Romanization; men given citizenship were *Romani facti*, and were expected to act as such.[57] Rome encouraged the disciplines and arts of peace; she did not otherwise set herself to mould men's minds and feelings, though moulded they inevitably were. Again, a man's possession of the citizenship did not prevent him from taking pride in being of Tarsus or Alexandria or Antioch or Bordeaux; [58] local spirit and local politics and even local antipathy to the central government or to Roman behavior continued to exist without let or hindrance (so long as it did not find expression in sedition or disorder).

Hadrian, whom we have seen reason to credit with an addition to our Feriale, encouraged the development of the union of Panhellenes.[59] Even more significant is the consistent official indifference to the progressive hellenization of many Roman *coloniae* in the Near East and to the use of the Palmyrene language after Palmyra acquired the status of a *colonia*.[60] What mattered was *Romana iustitia* [61] — an idea somewhat like 'the Law' in Kipling. It is noteworthy also that there is so little which is specifically Roman on the official imperial coin-issues of Alexandria and the Eastern Provinces.

The fact that for so long Latin was the language of *ius civile* and that (save by special dispensation) a citizen's will in any other speech was invalid counted for a good deal. But it must be recalled that, even before Claudius invaded Britain, native princes there struck coins with Latin legends; [62] later, the conquered were

[56] The Roman Citizenship, 168. Cf. the self-Hellenization of I Macc. 1. 11ff.

[57] Sherwin-White 3, 38. Cf. A. Momigliano's admirable review in J. Rom. St. XXXI (1941), 158ff.

[58] Cf. M. Hammond, Harv. St. Class. Phil. LX (1951), 147ff.; J. H. Oliver, Hesperia, XX (1951), 348f.

[59] Cf. Ziebarth in Pauly-Wissowa, XVIII iii, 583f.; P. M. Fraser, J. Rom. St. XL (1950), 77ff.; Oliver, l.c., 31ff.

[60] Cf. A. H. M. Jones, The Greek City, 61; W. Kubitschek, Sitz.-Ber. Wien, CLXXVII iv (1916). [Dio Prus.] XXXVII 26 addresses the men of Corinth as having become Greeks (they belonged to the Panhellenes; J. A. O. Larsen, Cl. Phil. XLVII, 1952, 8); ib. 25 the speaker makes a cryptic reference to himself as sacrificing property, civic standing and everything else by reason of his inclining to Greek rather than to Roman ways.

[61] Vell. Paterc. II 118.1; cf. S.H.A. Tacit. 15.2, Zosim. IV 30.4.

[62] F. Haverfield, Romanization of Roman Britain (ed. 4), 29. Cf. B. Saria, Historia, I (1950), 448 on the spread of Latin in Noricum and Pannonia before conquest; Charlesworth, Lost Province, 65 on Latin words in Old Irish. But against

under no direct pressure to abandon their old speech. Agricola's encouragement of schools was part of his whole policy of pacification; moreover, the language of Tacit. Agr. 21 does not prove but certainly suggests that this was a personal policy. Certainly there is nothing to indicate that the school at Augustodunum [63] was set up by the Roman authorities. H. Dessau, Gesch.d. röm. Kaiserzeit, I 507, 544 well observed that the real missionaries of Roman culture were the Augustan writers, above all Virgil and in a measure Livy.

Against this might be quoted a statement in Augustine, Civ. D.XIX 7, which is almost certainly due to Varro: [64]

> At enim opera data est, ut imperiosa civitas non solum iugum, verum etiam linguam suam domitis gentibus per pacem societatis inponeret, per quam non deesset, immo et abundaret etiam interpretum copia.

This, like Pliny's statement (N.H. III 39), *ferasque linguas sermonis commercio contraheret ad conloquia*, describes the effective outcome of Rome's conquest in Spain and Gaul (not in the Near East). We can set against it what Cicero said in defence of his client Archias.[65] It is of course true that Rome did not recognize any of the native languages by issuing documents with or in translation, as she always recognized Greek: [66] other lan-

---

exaggerated views of the supersession of the vernacular in Roman Britain cf. K. Jackson, Mediaeval Studies in Honor of J. D. M. Ford, 94ff. and L. Bieler, Vig. Chr. VI (1952), 66.

[63] Tac. Ann. III 43; cf. O. Hirschfeld, Kl. Schr. 124f., 191f., 206f. It is reasonable to suppose that when Sertorius established teachers of Greek and Latin at Osca (Plut. Sert. 14), his primary purpose was to train native Spaniards for positions of command.

[64] H. Fuchs, Augustin u.d. antike Friedensgedanke, 11f.; cf. St. Weinstock, Brit, Sch. Rome, XVIII (1950), 46. Prudent. Peristeph. II 427f. *idem loquuntur dissoni ritus, id ipsum sentiunt*, shows how far a statement of sentiment could outrun the linguistic facts; it was not long since Greek had been the common language of Christian worship in Rome (Chr. Mohrmann, Vig. Chr. III, 1949, 67ff.) as also of hymns to Cybele (Serv. in Georg. II 394).

Note in an earlier time Liv. XL 42.13 *Cumanis eo anno petentibus permissum ut publice Latine loquerentur et praeconibus Latine vendendi ius esset* (with Weissenborn's note).

[65] Arch. 23.

[66] Palmyrene also was recognized, but Palmyra was an exceptional community. Egyptian was recognized to the extent that candidates for priestly offices in temples had to pass examinations in it. The trilingual inscription of Gallus (Dess. 8995) was exceptional; the trilingual inscription on the Cross, set there as a warning, may have had parallels.

guages within the *orbis Romanus* were in effect 'barbarian'. Claudius deprived a prominent Greek of his Roman citizenship because he could not speak Latin, but Claudius himself used the phrase *utroque sermone nostro* and published historical works in Greek.[67] The Empire was in practice bilingual and even in the fourth century, when the use of Latin in the Near East had a temporary rise,[68] the bitter antipathy of Libanius did not prevent his being offered high dignities.

As for *interpretatio Romana*, the equation of native deities with Roman deities, it was just what *interpretatio* means, 'translation' — the use of Latin terms for the gods as for any other data of experience. Now it is conspicuous that Tacitus uses the phrase to describe what the Naharvali said about their gods; it was they who of their own initiative called them Castor and Pollux.[69] This is parallel to the way in which native informants of Herodotus, in Egypt and elsewhere, described their gods in terms of what may be called *interpretatio Graeca*. For Julius Caesar, and presumably for the source followed by him in speaking of Celtic religion,[70] it went without saying that the objects of native worship corresponded to the familiar deities. The acceptance of such identifications depended not on any *Kulturpolitik* but on assumptions which were axiomatic to Greeks and Romans and which were accepted as such by the new peoples who came within the orbit of their intellectual world. F. Drexel has indeed remarked that the fact of *interpretatio Romana* removed any occasion for a *Religionspolitik*; gods who admit of equation are not rivals.[71] This certainly applies to the period in which Roman antipathy to the Druidical priesthood (p. 214 later) was a thing of the past.

On Greek in official usage cf. A. Stein, Untersuchungen z. Gesch. u. Verwaltung Ägyptens, 132ff. and J. Stroux — L. Wenger, Die Augustus-Inschrift (Abh. Bayer. Ak. XXXIV ii, 1928), 18ff.

[67] Suet. Claud. 16 (with Smilda's note) 42; F. Jacoby, F. Gr. H. no. 276; cf. M. L. W. Laistner, The Greater Roman Historians, 141f.

[68] Cf. Ensslin in Pauly-Wissowa, VII A 2478; Nock, Speculum, XXVI (1951), 504f.; F. Dornseiff, D. Lit.-Z. LXXII, 1951, 250 (on a papyrus of Juvenal with Greek scholia).

[69] Germ. 43.4; it is *Romana*, not *Latina*, perhaps with an emphasis on the proud name of the imperial people; *Romanos rerum dominos gentemque togatam* (Aen. I 282).

[70] Cf. n. 104.

[71] Röm.-germ. Komm. XIV Ber. (1922), 7. For a statement that the gods are

Religion apart, did the Romans pursue a cultural policy in military matters? Latin was the official language, not only of the legions but also of the *auxilia* and probably of native formations; (in the fourth century the prayer to God prescribed by Constantine for his non-Christian soldiers was to be recited in Latin).[72] This had enormous consequences, but was surely in origin purely practical; how else could orders have been issued? (One cannot imagine anything like the rewards which used to be offered to officers in the British Army in India for learning of Urdu.) Yet there was no uniform policy about the taking of Roman names by recruits in auxiliary and naval units,[73] and, in spite of some early feeling that Greek was not the language for a soldier to use when giving evidence in Rome,[74] a transcript of the answer which the prefect of Egypt made to discontented ex-servicemen is in Greek.[75] Undoubtedly the army produced Romanization on a wide scale,[76] but I see no reason to believe that this was the result of a deliberate policy and of indoctrination. The Roman Army had no officers assigned to deal with morale, just as the Roman state had no Department of Education. The *librarius* and some others must be able to keep records; for the rest, all that mattered was to train good fighting men and to keep them such. This was not easy; the perils of a long stay in Egypt or Syria were familiar, and in Bell. Alex. 53.5 we read of the personnel of the Second Legion, stationed in Spain, as *diuturnitate iam factus provincialis*.

The distinguishing feature desired in Roman troops was *disciplina*. It is perhaps no accident that Hadrian, with all the philhellenism which he could allow himself, is apparently responsible for the cult of Disciplina just as for that of Roma aeterna (at least, the legend Disciplina Aug. appears first on his coins).

---

the same everywhere cf. Liv. XLII 3.9. Of course, even within a cultural unit local epithets such as Delios, Pythios, Ephesia had special value; for local rivalries cf. A. Daudet, Lettres de mon moulin, no. II.

[72] Euseb. V. Const. IV 19.

[73] Cf. G. Cantacuzène, Musée Belge, XXXI (1927), 168; L. Wickert, Würzb. Jahrb. IV (1949–50), 109. R. Marichal, L'occupation romaine de la basse Egypte, 31f.

[74] Suet. Tib. 71; Dio Cass. LVII 15.3.

[75] Cf. W. L. Westermann, Class. Phil. XXXVI (1941), 21ff., and Stein, Unters. 173ff. In the Dura painting (p. 199 above), the tribune is described in Latin, Themes and the Tychai in Greek.

[76] Cf. H. T. Rowell, Yale Class. Stud. VI 83.

Roman is as Roman does — in the way of obedience and courage, in the way of those who have learned the oldest Roman lesson in the oldest Roman school. So Tacitus says of a former royal cohort in Pontus which had been given Roman citizenship (Hist. III 47) *signa armaque in nostrum modum, desidiam licentiamque Graecorum retinebant* and (Agric. 28) of a cohort of Usipi *occiso centurione ac militibus qui ad tradendam disciplinam inmixti manipulis exemplum et rectores habebantur.* We have in Josephus two literary specimens of harangues to troops.[77] On each occasion the appeal is made to them as to Romans and this is the more conspicuous since the man who on the second occasion volunteers for a desperate assignment is a dark-skinned Syrian. Aristides was true to essential facts when he spoke of the Romans as 'counting no one that is qualified and needed for any task an alien.'[78]

(ii) Hellenistic Intervention in Religious Matters

Between Akhnaton and the Sassanian monarchy it would be hard to find outside Judaea any clear attempt by a state to direct the religious lives of its own members or subjects. A monarch glorified his own god or gods, but he had no particular concern that others should do likewise and there is very little that can be called deliberate and conscious religious policy. It has been widely supposed that Ptolemy I chose Sarapis as a figure in whose cult Greeks and Egyptians could be united, but this seems to me to involve the importation of an attitude belonging to dogmatic religions.[79] There were perhaps advantages for a new dynasty in

[77] B. J. III 472ff., VI 34ff. (esp. 38); cf. Herodian IV 14.7, VIII 7.4. On Disciplina cf. Richmond, Arch. Ael. IV xxi 165ff. Professor Bloch draws my attention also to Suet. Iul. 24.2 on the Transalpine legion raised by Caesar.

[78] Aristid. XXVI 74, p. 112 Keil (i. 352 Dindorf): I quote Saul Levin's version (Glencoe, Illinois, 1950).

[79] Cf. the criticism of E. Visser, Götter und Kulte im ptolemäischen Alexandrien, 20ff. If some Greek rulers seemed to favor Buddhism (W. W. Tarn, Greeks in Bactria and India, 175ff.), that was a different matter.

A word may be said about the tradition in Polyaen. IV 15 that Antiochus I ordered his troops and the whole countryside to celebrate a Persian festival, Περσικὴν ἑορτὴν θαλιάζειν (discussed by W. Otto, Beitr. z. Seleukidengesch. [Abh. Bayer. Akad. XXXIV i, 1927], 13 n. 1 and E. Bikerman, Institutions des Séleucides, 97). Surely it means simply 'a sumptuous banquet'; cf. Ps. Xen. Cyrop. VIII 8.10; Cornel. Nep. Pausan. 3.2; Hor. C. I. 38.1; Strab. 734; Hesych. s. v. συμβαριτικαῖς: and Dio Prus. III 136ff. (on Persian hunts). On a possible earlier attempt to use the cult of Nebo to unite Babylonia and Assyria cf. Lehmann-Haupt in Roscher, Lex. IV 679ff.

having a new deity: if any special appeal was intended, it was as Nilsson argued (Gesch. II 149) one directed to the Greek-speaking world as a whole and not to Egypt. Ptolemy I, as J. Kaerst remarked (Gesch. d. Hellenismus, II, ed. 2, 250), aimed at ruling more than the land of the Nile and in his account of Alexander he included propaganda for Sarapis (W. W. Tarn, Alexander the Great, II 70). It is indeed possible that we should see a special purpose in the building and maintenance (even after the general prohibition of paganism) of temples near and below the first Cataract, as places where the Blemmyes could be met on a friendly footing; the Egyptian Isis and the Nubian Mandulis were both worshipped here. This would, however, be the use of religious sanctities for a political end (such as was ascribed to Romulus when supposedly establishing the *asylum*); it would not be the encouraging of a particular worship for its own sake.[80] So, if Masinissa fostered the cult of the deities later called Cereres in Numidia, this was an expression in religious terms of his desire to guide nomadic tribes into the pursuits of peaceful agriculture.[81]

While it would be agreed that in general Hellenistic monarchs did not interfere with the beliefs and practices of their subjects, save by way of administrative control, above all where temple revenues were concerned, one supposed exception is often adduced — the statement in I Macc. 1 41f.;

> And King Antiochus wrote to his whole kingdom, that all should be one people, and that each should forsake his own laws. And all the nations agreed according to the word of the king.

No doubt the king favored the development of cities, making Babylon one; no doubt he magnified Zeus Olympios, with whom he so closely associated himself, and his attitude evoked some response from his subjects.[82] But it is impossible that he should have issued so sweeping an

[80] Cf. F. Ll. Griffith, J. Eg. Arch. XV (1929), 73f. and Cat. Demotic Graffiti . . . Dodecaschoenus, 3, 36; H. Kees, Pauly-Wissowa, XIX 2111. For Diocletian's policy cf. W. Ensslin, Sitz.-Ber. Bayer. Akad. 1942, i, 55.

[81] Cf. J. Carcopino, Aspects mystiques de la Rome païenne, 30 with my comments, J. Rom. St. XXXVIII, 1948, 157. Liban. Orat. XI 103 speaks of Seleucus I as continuing to hellenize what was barbarous; he is speaking of the foundation of cities.

[82] Cf. Tarn, Greeks in Bactria and India, 187, 191; H. Seyrig, Syria XX (1939) 298ff.; C. H. Kraeling, Gerasa, 31. For what was involved in self-equation with Zeus cf. Class. Phil. XXXVIII (1943) 54f. and an epitaph discussed by A. Wilhelm, Griechische Epigramme aus Kreta (Symb. Oslo. Fasc. suppl. XIII, 1950), 15f.

enactment,[83] and that it should have been obeyed. There is nothing to suggest that Babylonian or Syrian paganism was transformed; there is not even any indication that the many Jews living in Mesopotamia were disturbed in their hereditary observances. On such a point the argument from silence is very strong, for the story of persecutors does not suffer from understatement. When a zealous official interfered for a moment with the Samaritans, it was probably because of a confusion arising from their nearness to the Jewish temple-state.

If Antiochus said anything such as is ascribed to him, it must have been, as Eduard Meyer saw,[84] in the preamble to an edict: 'whereas . . .'. Meyer supposed the statement as quoted to come from the edict suppressing Jewish observances in Palestine, but Bickermann and I. Heinemann have produced good arguments to the contrary,[85] and for this purpose the preamble would have greatly overshot the mark. It is indeed thinkable that some such words served to introduce an edict ordering a monthly celebration of the king's birthday, such as is indicated in II Macc. 6.7.

Φερσεφόνας ἐσιδὼν κρέσσονα Φερσεφόναν (with the type of hyperbole discussed by H. W. Prescott, Trans. Am. Philol. Assoc. LXIII, 1932, 105). The variation in Hammurabi's titulature (C. W. McEwan, Oriental Origin of Hellenistic Kingship, 10) is a warning against the ascription of too much meaning to any identifications of kings with gods. Cf. Pan. Lat. XI 10. p. 284.34f. ed. Baehrens, where the implied Iovius shades into Iuppiter and the implied Herculius into Hercules and W. Ensslin, Sitz.— Ber. Bayer. Akad. 1943, vi, 49.

[83] W. Otto, Z. Gesch. d. Zeit d. 6. Ptolemäers (Abh. Bayer. Akad. N. F. XI, 1934), 85, appreciates the strangeness of the edict but regards it as genuine and explains it from the neurotic condition which he attributes to Antiochus, after the day on which the Romans brusquely compelled him to evacuate Egypt. A slightly hysterical note is indeed seen in some Imperial edicts of the fourth century A.D. (J. Bibl. Lit. LX, 1941, 91), but Tarn, op. cit., 183ff. seems to me to have disproved Otto's view of the king's psychology.

The statement of Seleucus 'I will impose on you, not the customs of Persians or other races, but this law, which is common to all, that whatever a king determines is always just' (App. Syr. 61; Ed. Meyer, Blüte u. Niedergang d. Hellenismus, 44) has been quoted as a parallel; but Seleucus was making a speech to gain the army's consent to an arrangement, and he was perhaps echoing the supposed Persian law which Herodot. III 31 makes the Persian judges quote to Cambyses. (Cf. the Athenian decree quoted by Plut. Demetr. 24.9.)

[84] Ursprung u. Anfänge d. Christentums, II, 158.

[85] E. Bickermann, Der Gott d. Makkabäer, 127ff.; I. Heinemann, Monatschr. Gesch. Wiss. Jud. LXXXII (1938), 161ff. As for the suggestion that Antiochus was setting up a general cult of Zeus Kapetolios, I feel that the king's unfinished temple to that god at Antioch (Liv. XLI 20.9; cf. U. Bianchi, Mem. Lincei, VIII, ii, 1949, 371 n.3, 376 n.3, on its possible completion by Tiberius, which would be like Hadrian's completion of the Olympieion at Athens, but hardly fits the emperor's economical policy as described by Suet. Tib. 46f.) belongs to an early phase of his rule. His later concern was probably to create an Eastern counterpoise to Rome (Tarn, op. cit., 206).

But is the record dependable? Its only support comes from Daniel 11. 36–8 (and by implication, chs. 3 and 6). There is nothing like it in II Macc. or in the pagan source (usually thought to be Nicolaus of Damascus) followed by Josephus in his Jewish War; it is moreover omitted from the abridgment of I Macc. made later by Josephus in his Antiquities.[86] Is it not a generalization from a Palestinian standpoint? Certainly there was no attempt at levelling or *Gleichschaltung* and none of the ignoring of earlier worships asserted by Daniel 11.37f. This is confirmed by what Antiochus did in the very next year after the supposed general ordinance and after the undoubted transformation of worship in the Temple. In 166 the king held his great festival at Daphne.[87] Polybius, in describing the procession (XXX 25.13), says, 'It is not possible to set forth the number of images; there were carried those of all gods or *daimones* told of or worshipped among men, and also likenesses of heroes, some gilded and some clothed in garments interwoven with gold. All these were accompanied by their appropriate myths, set forth in costly representations in accordance with received traditions.' 'All gods or *daimones*,' you will notice; there was no special emphasis on Zeus Olympios and no sign at all of the king's supposed divinity. In view of this, we can, I think, dismiss the idea that Antiochus expressed or had any such general policy as is imputed to him. There had been what was from his standpoint a revolt in this small temple-state within his dominions; he struck back with retaliatory measures and his orders were defied.[88] It is possible that he had exaggerated the eagerness of many in Jerusalem to embrace the externals of Hellenic life,[89] and thought that he could there establish a *polis* which would be a bastion of defence; in any event, that he appears as a persecutor may be regarded as the result of circumstances.

(iii) Official Roman Intervention in Religious Matters

When Rome entered on the inheritance of the Seleucids, as of the other Hellenistic rulers, and proceeded to carry out her creative work in the west, she retained her set pattern of public religious life. Its conduct rested with the priestly *collegia*, even

[86] In XII 269 he does echo I Macc. 2.19, which implies the same idea. — I Macc. 3.29 shows a comparable lack of sense of proportion; it was natural under the circumstances. (On Daniel 3ff., cf. H. H. Rowley, The Servant of the Lord and other Essays, 263ff.)

[87] Cf. Tarn, 193f.

[88] Cf. Joseph B. J. I. 34.

[89] Cf. Otto, op. cit. 84, 'Der König hat offenbar geglaubt, eine im Gang befindliche Entwicklung nicht mehr abwarten zu dürfen.'

as the conduct of domestic acts of piety rested with the householder. Citizens were under a religious obligation to abstain from work on *feriae* (p. 189 above) and were ordered to take part in certain special observances, e.g. *supplicationes* and the vow made in 217, but there were normally no sanctions; [90] it must have been assumed that every citizen would wish to do his duty. Official intervention was confined to situations which seemed to involve a threat to good public order.[91] The Bacchanalia was a classic example; [92] in general, apart from the specific charges then advanced of murder, fraud, perjury and unnatural vice, there was the seeming fact of *coniuratio*, which could at any time lead to penalties; [93] so (by law) could certain forms of magic. On the other hand, neglect of traditional pieties was not a ground for condemnation; there is nothing in Republican Rome comparable with the indictment of Socrates for both neglecting the gods of the city and introducing others.[94]

Cicero (De legibus II 19, cf. 25) laid down the principle *separatim nemo habessit deos neve novos neve advenas nisi publice adscitos*; *privatim colunto, quos rite a patribus cultos acceperint . . . sacra sollemnia obeunto*, but did not make any such provision for its enforcement as did Plato, Laws, 909f. for his ban on private sanctuaries. Cicero was expressing a traditional antipathy, usually latent but capable of being brought into action by any sufficient provocation. Livy repeatedly represents magistrates and the Senate as inveighing against the practice of unrecognized

[90] Liv. XXII 10. The penalty imposed on senators who did not observe the birthday of Divus Julius (Dio Cass. XLVII 18.5) was a political measure. Cf. J. Bibl. Lit. LX (1941) 93 n.21.

[91] Cf. H. M. Last, J. Rom. St. XXVII (1937), 80ff.; Nock, Camb. Anc. Hist. X, 481, 489ff., 495f., 500, 503.

[92] Cf. Cic. Leg. II 37; R. M. Grant, Harv. Theol. Rev. XLI (1948), 273f.

[93] Cf. Mommsen, Strafrecht, 562ff.; A. H. McDonald, J. Rom. St. XXXIV (1944), 15, 27ff.; W. Kroll in Pauly-Wissowa, XVII, 201f. (on *sodalicium sacrilegii Nigidiani*: there was a suspicion of occultism); Acta proc. S. Cypriani 4 (*nefariae . . . conspirationis*): Cels. ap. Orig. in Cels. I, 1.

[94] Cf. A. J. Festugière in Coniectanea Neotestamentica XI (1947, Lund), 66ff. It is hard to imagine a Roman parallel to the ephebic oath at Athens 'I will honor the ancestral *hiera*' (L. Robert, Et. épigr. philol. 296ff.), there was at Rome nothing like the 'éducation religieuse' described by A. J. Festugière–P. Fabre, Le monde gréco-romain aux temps de Notre-Seigneur, I 87ff.

sacra and the neglect of those which were traditional; [95] this may well correspond to the facts. So later Tacitus (no doubt correctly) makes Claudius ascribe the decay of the art of the *haruspices* to two causes, indifference and the strength of foreign superstitions.[96] Nevertheless, nothing was done to enforce active conformity to the principle, *sacra sollemnia obeunto*.

The Augustan Restoration brought the rebuilding of temples and the revival of rites which had fallen into disuse; it was a renewal of Roman religion (including the cults introduced from the outside under official auspices; Magna Mater benefited just as did Vesta). This seemed indispensable for morale, and was, I think, sincere.[97]

Suetonius says of Augustus *peregrinarum caerimoniarum sicut veteres ac praeceptas reverentissime coluit, ita ceteras contemptui habuit* (Aug. 93), quoting in illustration his respect for the Mysteries of Eleusis (in which he had been initiated), his refusal to visit Apis, and his praise of a grandson for not making an offering at Jerusalem.[98] He certainly banned Egyptian cults from the area within the *pomerium* (the technical boundary of the city, a boundary to which he probably attached more religious importance than had been usual).[99] He had perhaps some personal feeling, as a result of the bitter struggle with Cleopatra, who had so emphatically identified herself with Isis; *terruit illa suo, si fas, Capitolia*

[95] Liv. I 20.6, IV 30.11, XXV, 1.12, XXXIX 15.3, 16.8; cf. Virg. Aen. VIII 185ff., Propert IV 1.17ff. and Dio Cass. LII 36.2 (Maecenas represented as advising Augustus to tolerate neither godless men nor magicians).

[96] Ann. XI, 15.

[97] Cf. p. 196 above and Camb. Anc. Hist. X 475ff.

[98] The statement in Dio Cass. LI 16, and Julian Ep. 111 Bidez that Augustus gave the god Sarapis as one of his reasons for sparing Alexandria in 30 is not supported by the parallels quoted by Nachstädt on Plut. Mor. 207A and may be regarded as coming from Alexandrian propaganda such as we see in the so-called 'Alexandrian martyr-acts.'

As for the Jerusalem incident, the explanation probably lies in cultural antipathy such as Horace expresses; certainly there was no loss of Jewish privileges under Augustus and Jews could depend on Roman protection against local pressures.

[99] E. Aust, De aedibus sacris (Diss. Marburg, 1889), 47ff. shows that there was not in early times any general principle of excluding imported cults from the *pomerium*.

In early times, executions were naturally performed outside the *pomerium* (Latte, Pauly-Wissowa, Supp. VII 1618); but in later years its main significance was constitutional. For the feeling that worship *extra pomerium* entailed some inferiority cf. Dio Cass. XL 47.4.

sistro.[100] Yet, as far as the *pomerium* was concerned, the question was one of propriety; so under the Republic altars to Isis on the Capitol had been demolished. There was nothing to prevent a citizen from having a statuette of Isis in his *lararium* or from going to worship in the temple in the Campus Martius; when the gentle Tibullus tells of Delia's devotion to Isis or recounts in formal style the Praises of Osiris,[101] his tone does not smack of defiance.

The only cult in which Augustus forbade citizens to participate was Druidism.[102] Last has recently brought forward cogent arguments against the idea that this action and the prohibition of Druidism *in toto* by Claudius were due to a fear of a political danger in the religion.[103] They can be reinforced by N. J. De Witt's analysis of the position of the Druids in Celtic society at the time of Julius; the conclusion, which seems to me very probable, is that the account in De bello Gallico VI 13–4 is borrowed from an idealizing portrait of their role a little earlier and that their influence in Caesar's time had greately diminished.[104] Last maintains that once more Rome acted on a moral issue, abhorrence of human sacrifice. This undoubtedly counted for much. Yet it would have been easy to forbid the practice, as had been done earlier among the Bletonesii,[105] and any other objectionable features in the cult, without going any further; there could have been something like the conscience clause in the Senatusconsultum de Bacchanalibus which permitted people to continue worship with appropriate restrictions and safeguards. To be sure, there were other features in Druidism to arouse suspicion. There was the practice of foretelling the future, which might count with Augustus, who destroyed over 2000 *fatidici libri*; [106] later on, Druidical prophecies of the destruction of Rome played a part in winning support for the

[100] Lucan X 63; on Cleopatra cf. my forthcoming paper in Aegyptus.

[101] I 3.23ff., 7.27ff. (with Gnomon XXI, 1949, 221ff. and Klingner, Eranos, XLIX, 1951, 117ff.).

[102] Suet. Claud. 25.5. — Augustus vowed and dedicated a temple to the Gaulish wind-god Circius (Sen. N.Q. V 17.5), presumably in gratitude for some special mercy.

[103] J. Rom. St. XXXIX (1949), 1ff.

[104] Trans. Am. Philol. Ass. LXIX (1938), 319ff.

[105] C. Cichorius, Röm. Studien, 7ff. Cf. S. H. A. M. Ant. phil. 23.8 *sacra Serapidis a vulgaritate Pelusiaca summovit* (did Arnuphis advise the emperor?).

[106] Suet. Aug. 31.1.

revolt of Civilis.[107] Again, there was Druidical magic; Claudius condemned to death a Roman *eques* for bringing into court with him one of their magic eggs.[108]

Now the original measure of Augustus must have applied almost solely to Gauls who had received Roman citizenship; in spite of the attraction of the exotic for Roman society, the theory that the Druids were philosophers, and the respect which Diviciacus had gained, and in spite of the later spread of the cult of Epona, I find it hard to believe that native Romans were interested — at least that enough were interested to make a prohibition seem worth while. I therefore venture to suggest that the main motive of Augustus was a feeling that men who after receiving Roman citizenship were still attached to what was *ex hypothesi* a barbarous and cruel superstition would show themselves to be 'unreconstructed.' The extension of this prohibition to a total ban under Claudius may conceivably have been connected with the invasion of Britain, since Caesar had reported that Britain had a primacy in their priestly lore.[109] Certainly Druids were prominent later in the defence of Anglesea; [110] by then, to be sure, they had a grievance.

While Augustus took action in the matter of Druidism, he did not otherwise change Rome's attitude towards the observance of cults which lacked the state's recognition. Official interference was mainly *ad hoc*, stimulated by some particular scandal or incident; for the moment it might affect the whole local category to which the offender belonged. In a similar way astrologers in general were banished from Italy after Libo's dealings with some of them became known; but the art was practised elsewhere without let or hindrance, and Tiberius continued to consult his court astrologer.[111] Further, such measures were usually short-lived.

[107] Tac. Hist. IV 54; cf. Dio Cass. LXII 6.1 on Boudicca's art of divination.

[108] Plin. XXIX 54; ib. XXX 13 on Druids as magicians and on what a good thing it was to suppress them (also XVI 249). Cf. for the latitude of the definition of magic, Nock in F. J. Jackson–K. Lake, Beginnings of Christianity, V 172ff. For the feeling against magic cf. Virg. Aen. IV 493, with A. S. Pease's note. It was a good charge to combine with others, *ad invidiam*.

[109] Bell. Gall. VI 13 (which Claudius must have read).

[110] Tac. Ann. XIV 30 (here too the cruelty of their ritual is stressed); cf. Macdonald, Pauly-Wissowa, XVI 42f.

[111] Tac. Ann. II 27ff.; cf. XII 52 and note Hist. I 22, where they are a *genus hominum*, like the Christians in Suet. Nero, 16. No special reason is given for the

It was this type of procedure and the old magistratual police jurisdiction, *coercitio*, as now applied with an arbitrary authoritarianism which was very far from the austere precision of civil law,[112] and not the possibility of construing magic as *veneficium* or certain forms of religious behavior as *maiestas* (elastic as that term was), which set the pattern for Nero's action against the Christians. The supposed incendiarism of some Christians in Rome and a general suspicion of the movement led to the treatment of Christians in general on the spot as *ipso facto* liable to summary punishment.[113] To the sequel we shall return. Meanwhile we may recall a few other specific measures. Hadrian's ban on circumcision, later mitigated to a ban on the circumcision of those who were not Jews by birth (with dispensations also for candidates for Egyptian priestly posts) was probably not religious in origin; there may have been some anti-Jewish animus in the measure, but circumcision seemed to be a mutilation and to belong to the category of things regarded as undesirable.[114] Septimius Severus forbade people becoming Jews (or Christians); [115] the antipathy to proselytes expressed by Juvenal XIV 100ff. was no doubt intensified by the risings under Hadrian.

Hereafter there was an increasing interest in the curbing of movements which under the guise of religion appeared to be

---

expulsion of astrologers from Italy by Vitellius; but when a prophecy of his doom followed, he condemned to death without a hearing all who were accused (Suet. Vitell. 14.4). Again, just as Pliny asked whether the *nomen ipsum* or the *flagitia cohaerentia nomini* should be punished, it was later debated which was punishable, knowledge of astrology or the active practice of the art (Mommsen, Strafrecht, 863 n.7, cf. 641 n.2 on magic). Dio Cass. LVI 25.5 remarked that Augustus, while taking strong measures against astrologers, displayed his horoscope prominently (as on coins); again, Manilius addressed his poem to Augustus.

[112] For the way in which *coercitio* lacked precise limits cf. Mommsen, Ges. Schr. III 396; for the arbitrary character of the action of provincial governors, S. Lieberman, Ann. inst. philol. hist. orient. et slaves VII (1939–44), 428ff. In the *mandata principum* (on which cf. M. I. Finkelstein, Tijdschrift v. Rechtsgeschiedenis, XIII, 1934, 150ff.) provincial governors were given general instructions *malis hominibus provinciam purgare* (Dig. I 18.3); Proculus laid down the principle that a governor was to consider not what had been done at Rome but *quid fieri debeat* (ib. I 18. 12). After all, Tacitus says of Augustus' actions on the discovery of adultery in his family circle, *suasque ipse leges egrediebatur* (Ann. III 24.3).

[113] Tac. Ann. XV 44; cf. H. Fuchs, Vig. Christ. IV (1950), 65ff.

[114] Mommsen, Strafr. 638; R. Reitzenstein, Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Fragen, 1ff. Cf. Dio Cass. LXXIX 11.1 for horror at the circumcision of Elagabalus.

[115] S.H.A. Sev. 17. Note that he safeguarded Jewish *superstitio* in relation to the decurionate. (Dig. L 2, 3.3)

threats to public order; from the late second and early third century we have various enactments directing the punishment of those who prophesied as though inspired, or introduced new and unsettling *religiones*, or caused the minds of others to be terrified by superstitious fears of divinity.[116] Later came Diocletian's edict against the Manichees; one phrase in it is to be remembered,

> *Romanam gentem modestam atque tranquillam et universum orbem nostrum velut venenis de suis malevolis inficere,*

which recalls the old charge against certain Jews at Rome in 139 B.C.[117] The moral note was struck again both by Licinius when he forbade Christians worshipping in mixed congregations and by Constantine when he suppressed the cult at Aphaca.[118]

To sum up, the state interfered not because the Roman gods were failing to get their due but because particular practices or groups were held to be unsuitable or subversive or demoralizing. That is in substance true of official action against the Christians prior to Decius.

When *Isiaci* and Jews were banished from Rome under Tiberius no question arose whether this or that individual had committed any offence save that of being what he was; when astrologers were expelled, it was all who were identified as such and not only those who had answered questions about the ruler's horoscope. When Druidical cultus was put down, all its practices were suppressed, not simply human sacrifice or magic. So from Trajan's time, at least, to profess Christianity and to act as Christians did was in itself enough to make a man liable to the death penalty.[119] The enforcement of this was sporadic, and at times it was in fact completely abandoned,[120] but in theory it could always take place. Herein the situation was different from the analogies mentioned,

[116] Mommsen, Ges. Schr. III 398 n.6, 408 n.1.

[117] Mos. et Rom. leg. coll. XV 3.4; K. Stade, Der Politiker Diokletian, 88. For the parallel, cf. Val. Max. I, 3.3.

[118] Euseb. V. Const, I, 53, III 55 (there was no such objection to the cult of Asclepius at Aegae, ib. 56 — with Sozomen II 5 — unless the charge of priestly fraud was raised): cf. III 58, IV 25.

[119] Baynes, Camb. Anc. Hist. XII 655; for later discussion cf. J. Zeiller, Anal. Boll. LXVII (1949) 49ff.

[120] Cf. Gnomon, XXIII (1951), 48ff. and for a later period, Euseb. H. E. VIII 1.

for the other punitive measures petered out [121] or had to be renewed by specific ordinance.

It is clear that the younger Pliny knew that Christians were as such liable to punishment, but did not know just how or under what circumstances they were liable; he had no instructions in what corresponded to Standing Ordinances (cf. n. 112).

After all, Trajan replied, *Neque enim in universum aliquid, quod quasi certam formam habeat, constitui potest.* Pliny's order to suspected persons that they should make an act of worship before Trajan's image together with those of gods looks like an improvised test, applicable to non-citizens as well as to citizens. There is no evidence whatsoever that either citizens or non-citizens were in a normal way under any legal obligation to perform such acts of worship on their own. To be sure, reluctance to pay homage to the ruler's image if expressed by anyone other than a Jew, whose peculiarities were known and except in times of tension accepted, would have created some suspicion of disloyalty; but there would have been no consequences, unless some one had an interest in framing a charge. When, however, Pliny as governor gave such an order as he did (which he would not have given to a Jew), he was satisfied that he was fully within his rights in punishing disobedience. This did not mean that anyone, citizen or non-citizen, was under a normal obligation so to act, any more than the fact that a citizen must 'move on' when so ordered by a policeman implies an intrinsic duty of perpetual motion.

There is an instructive phrase in the Passio SS. Scillitanorum (14); the magistrate, in pronouncing sentence says . . . *ritu Christiano se vivere confessos, quoniam oblata sibi facultate ad Romanorum morem redeundi obstinanter perseveraverunt.*[122] The word *obstinanter* recalls Pliny's *pertinaciam certe et inflexibilem obstinationem debere puniri.*[123] Whatever Christianity might or might not be, its practice when once forbidden was a defiance of authority.

[121] Certainly the private cults of Dionysus in Italy revived after the suppression of the Bacchanalia; the statement in Serv. on Ecl. V 29 that Julius Caesar was the first to introduce the rites of Liber Pater into Rome is properly dismissed by H. J. Rose, The Eclogues of Vergil, 132.

[122] O. v. Gebhardt, Ausgewählte Märtyreracten, 25.

[123] Ep. X 96.3.

Pliny was a man of gentle piety, living at a time when all seemed right with the world. When he reported that people were again thronging to the Bithynian temples and that acts of worship were being revived, it was not as a thing which must of itself needs bring joy and relief to a devout citizen, but as an indication of how large a number of men could be set right if given a chance of turning from their errors; this *contagio*, this disease of the spirit, could be remedied by the appropriate procedure.[124] Trajan Decius came to the throne in very different days. When just after the supposed conclusion of Rome's first thousand years of life he ordered a great general act of worship, he may well have done so in a genuine conviction that this was a timely remedy *ruentis imperi rebus*. At the same time, he clearly wished to stamp out Christianity or perhaps rather to stamp out the Christian refusal to participate in corporate observances.[125] Not only did everyone have to get a *libellus*, or certificate that he had offered sacrifice and libation and partaken of the flesh of victims; but everyone had to sign a statement that he had previously been constant in sacrifice. For this statement no corroboration was required, though there were probably many pagans who could not truthfully have made such a declaration. Loyalism in religion was defined: what was this loyalism?

Was Decius concerned to restore old Roman piety? To be sure, from this time onward, inscriptions at Rome show a new intensity of feeling for Vesta.[126] Yet the obligation of sacrifice could be performed before any civic deities, and the *libelli* speak simply of sacrifice 'to the gods' and do not specify 'to the gods of the Romans'

[124] Cf. Liv. XXXIX 9.1 *velut contagione morbi*; R. M. Grant, Harv. Theol. Rev. XLI (1948), 274. Contrast Julian Ep. 84 'Hellenism (i.e., paganism) is not yet progressing as it should.'

[125] Cf. (for the continuation of the policy under Valerian) Acta Cypr. 1, *eos qui Romanam religionem non colunt, debere Romanas caeremonias recognoscere* (with R. Reitzenstein, Sitz.-Ber. Heidelberg, 1913, xiv 12). This is how it looked to Christians at least. On Decius cf. Baynes, l. c. 656f. I do not know of any evidence on the point, but Jews must have been dispensed from compliance; cf. Cels. ap. Orig. Cels. V, 41 and p. 221 later (on Julian) for the attitude towards them of opponents of Christianity. [S. Lieberman, Ann. phil. hist. orient. VII, 1939–44, 403 quotes a Talmudic statement that Diocletian dispensed the Jews from offering libations.]

[126] Harv. Theol. Rev. XXIII (1930), 251ff.

or anything of the sort (and neither *to* nor *for* the Emperor).[127] When we look at the coins of Decius, we see a gallery of portraits of good emperors, but no striking divine types and, curiously enough, Decius does not on them use the title Pontifex Maximus,[128] which we should certainly expect if he had wished to emphasize the old rites of the city. So again under Diocletian and his associates it is once more 'the immortal gods' in general to whom people were forcibly led back.

Diocletian was passionately Roman in feeling and the new titulature of Jovii and Herculii put him and his associates in rule under the protection of old deities of the eternal city. Yet Juppiter was no more distinct from Zeus for him than for Virgil; at most the name suggested the majesty of the distant Capitol. For Diocletian, as for the Panegyrici and later for Ammianus Marcellinus, 'Godhead was one; there were many telephone lines and they ran through a number, small but appreciable, of different switchboards. You used one or another according to what seemed appropriate for a particular purpose or place.' [129] So he was prepared to go outside the old Roman circle of gods: before starting the persecution he consulted not the faraway Sibylline books (themselves after all *ex hypothesi* Greek in origin) but the oracle of Didyma, at which shrine he had earlier made dedications in a language of deep devotion.[130] Elsewhere he showed his piety

[127] Knipfing, ib. XVI (1923), 345ff. Pionius was apparently asked to make an offering in the Nemeseion at Smyrna (v. Gebhardt, Märt. 101f.).

[128] He had the title (C.I.L. II, 4957f.). Its omission on coins is sometimes inexplicable; so on those of Hadrian after ca. 125 (B.M.C. III xxv), of Antoninus Pius after 141 (except for B.M.C. IV 72; cf. Mommsen, Z. f. Numism. I, 1874, 238ff.), of Commodus before 184 (B.M.C. IV cli n.1). But the predecessor and successor of Decius alike used it, and so the failure of Decius to do so perhaps deserves note. On his coinage in general cf. Mattingly-Sydenham-Sutherland, R. Imp. Coinage, IV, iii, 116, and Mattingly, Camb. Anc. Hist. XII, 719 and Num. Chron. 1949, 80. A similar neutrality is however to be seen in the issues of Constantius II and Constans (Mattingly, ib. 1933, 190f.) and of Julian in general, (Webb, ib. 1910, 238ff.), as also later (J. W. Pearce in Mattingly etc., R. Imp. Coinage, IX xli).

[129] J. Rom St. XXXVII (1947), 104; cf. Anon. De Hippomacho, cited in Nock, Conversion, 293. (For the need of such advice in Egypt, when the problem was neither Judaism nor Christianity, cf. F. Zucker, Abh. Berlin, 1937, vi, 14 n.3 and Juvenal XV).

[130] A. Rehm, Philol. XCIII (1938), 74ff.; H. Grégoire, Byzantion, XIV (1939), 319ff.

towards the Celtic Belenus,[131] and he and his co-rulers honored Mithras as *fautor imperii sui.*[132] So later Maximinus Daia and Julian championed the old gods — not a particular group; Julian's plan to restore the Temple at Jerusalem, while reflecting his hostility to Christianity and perhaps a special feeling against the magnificent Christian church which Constantine had erected in that city, was consistent with his general policy; the Jews had ancestral tradition, and the Christians were in his eyes rebels.

Rome was not just a city, however great; she was the centre of a world and she retained her claim to universalism. From of old she had received gods as well as men, and they had brought their gifts. This is stressed by Aristides XXVI 105 (p. 122 Keil) and Claudian XXIV 166ff. (p. 226 Birt); [133] so Aristides tells of blessings conferred under Roman rule by all deities including those of Egypt, whose favors, he says, like those of Asclepius, have now most increased. In the Octavius of Minucius Felix (6), Caecilius, as the courteous defender of paganism speaks of the various provinces and cities as having their individual rituals while the Romans have all rituals as their own; *sic, dum universarum gentium sacra suscipiunt, etiam regna meruerunt.* Rome was, as Rutilius says, (I 49) *genetrix hominum genetrixque deorum*; a queen throwing her mantle over the world and not a city on the Tiber which had fought and schemed her way to a power that she must by force retain.

After all, Virgil told of Aeneas as giving *sacra deosque* (XII 192), while the language was to remain Latin and the Trojans were to be absorbed (825, 834ff.).[134] Rome's religious history was studded with the importation and establishment of cults in accordance with what was found in the Sibylline books. Long before the copying of the Feriale Duranum, Isis and Sarapis had been received among the Roman gods and represented on official coinage. We cannot attach much importance to the mockery of deities of foreign origin in the sarcastic writings of Lucian, who may after all be at times at least echoing the Hellenistic wit of Menippus,

[131] Dessau 625; for other religious activities cf. Ensslin, Pauly-Wissowa, VII A 2479.

[132] Dessau 659.

[133] Cf. n. 231.

[134] Liv. I, 2.4 *Latinos utramque gentem appellavit.*

and in Christian apologetic, which could both poke fun at the beastly devices of the heathen and also make capital out of the fact that deities once excluded from the Capitol now received full honors at Rome. Mithras, indeed, and Juppiter Dolichenus were never officially received, but they certainly enjoyed exalted patronage and full approval; individual emperors took an interest in Mithras and various officers, as at Dura, built or restored Mithraea; the large Mithraeum in the substructure of the Baths of Caracalla [135] cannot have been established without official permission. So also one of the earliest temples built by a *legatus* in the area outside the camp at Lambaesis was dedicated to Dolichenus.[136]

Did not Marcus Aurelius issue coins with the legend RELIG(io) AVG(usti) accompanied by the representation of Mercury, sometimes standing in a temple which has Egyptian features, to commemorate the deliverance of the troops by rain supposedly secured by the rites performed to Thoth by the Egyptian sacred scribe Arnuphis? [137] And yet this is an outspokenly Egyptian cult, shown as such. As for the idea that by the Constitutio Antoniniana, Caracalla planned or hoped to create a new religious unity founded on the cult of the Roman gods, it is a misunderstanding of the preamble in which the 'lover of Sarapis,' [138] the man who brought Sarapis within the pomerium,[139] represented the extension of the citizenship as a thank-offering to the immortal gods for the death of Geta.[140] Caracalla himself turned for aid also to the Celtic Apollo Grannus.[141]

[135] Excavations at Dura-Europos, Rep. VII/VIII 85; G. Lugli, I monumenti ant. di Roma I 428 fig. 95 and M. J. Vermaseren, De Mithrasdienst in Rome (Diss. Utrecht, 1951), 80ff. The recent discoveries at Carrawburgh include votive altars dedicated by three *praefecti* of the *cohors I Batavorum* (I. A. Richmond — J. P. Gillam — E. Birley, The Temple of Mithras at Carrawburgh [in Arch. Ael. 1951], 45ff.).

[136] Dess. 4311a.

[137] H. Mattingly, B.M.C.R. Emp. IV cxxxix; J. Guey, Rev. Phil. LXXIV (1948), 16ff. and Mél. arch. hist. LX (1948), 105ff., LXI (1949), 93ff.; J.-L. Robert, Rev. ét. gr. LVII (1944), 239 and LXII (1949), 159; Alföldi, Pisciculi [Ant. u. Chr. Erg. I, 1939], 13.

[138] Cf. J. Vogt, Alex. Münzen, I 171f.

[139] Wissowa, Rel. 89; for Sarapis as later *comes* of the emperor cf. J. Rom. St. XXXVII (1947), 102.

[140] Cf. Sherwin-White, Roman Citizenship, 220ff. For Caracalla's flamboyance, cf. Dio Cass. LXXVIII 3.3.

[141] Dio LXXVIII 15.6.

Individual emperors had their preferences, for which I may refer to Camb. Anc. Hist. XII 413ff., but the individual citizen felt free to follow them or not as he chose. The short and misguided attempt of Elagabalus to establish the primacy of his own Elagabal was unique: otherwise, it is hard to see a deliberate positive religious policy between Augustus and Aurelian.

To conclude this section, there is no reason to hold that, at the time when the Feriale Duranum was copied, there was any official desire to see the soldiers worshipping the gods listed in it rather than other gods.

(iv) Pagans and Christians in the Roman Army

If there was any wish to condition the soldiers and create in them a particular sentiment for the ancient Roman gods, its success was decidedly limited. The Capitoline triad,[142] Mars, and Victoria received abundant private military dedications in the West, but so did also other deities, not least Silvanus. The material for the Near East might repay a special study; here too we find the popular Silvanus.[143] For Egypt, J. Lesquier assembled the evidence, and there is a notable lack of Roman deities and a preponderating interest in those of the land.[144] Men were, again, and remained strongly attached to the worships of their homes. Thus, C.I.L. VI 32543 records the homage of men from Philippopolis, all in subdivisions of the praetorian guard, to their native Asclepius; the men call themselves *cives*, i.e. fellow-citizens of their old town. Praetorians from Belgica made a similar dedication to their ancestral deities.[145] Surely it is precisely such feelings which any policy of Romanization in religion might have sought to combat.

Further, if there had been anything like a deliberate and sustained attempt to create traditional religious feelings in the army, it is hard to see how Christians would have found life in its ranks

[142] Cf. J. Toutain, Cultes païens, I 191f.

[143] Cumont, Et. syr. 162ff.

[144] L'armée romaine d'Egypte (Mém. inst. fr. d'arch. or. XLI), 279ff. Mr. C. H. Roberts observes that in the remarkable military correspondence published by H. C. Youtie and J. G. Winter in P. Mich. VIII Sarapis is the only divinity to count (no. 499.5 'the gods here').

[145] Dessau 2096; cf. Alföldi, Camb. Anc. Hist. XII 211 n.3. For the strength of regional character in armies cf. Plut. Galb. 22, Herodian III 7.2.

tolerable. Yet when Tertullian published his Apologeticum he could claim (37) *hesterni sumus et vestra omnia implevimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa*; he could say (42) *navigamus et nos vobiscum et militamus . . .* ; he could tell how the prayers of Christian soldiers had obtained rain for the hard-pressed army of Marcus Aurelius.[146] Later as a rigorist, he wrote his De corona militis; this makes it clear that the hero of the work, who faced death in preference to wearing a wreath on the occasion of an Imperial donative, was regarded by the rank and file of Christians as a zealot.[147] Others also were seized with scruples, doffed their insignia, and paid the price.[148] Yet in general, while there is little evidence for Christians in the praetorian guard, it would appear that from the beginning of the third century many Christians found service in the army compatible with their beliefs.[149]

Diocletian and his associates used the dismissal of Christians from the army, as from office, as a penal measure. The soldier had a privileged position, which guaranteed a livelihood and pension and which offered a carrière ouverte aux talents: it was so when Aristides wrote in the middle of the second century,[150] and even more so afterwards. As far as Diocletian is concerned, we should not, I think, imagine him as inspired by any reluctance to lead out to war soldiers who did not worship the old gods in the old way: for many years he had commanded armies including many Christians, there had been no military disaster to evoke strange fears and there was no war in progress. Diocletian was not a Julian, concerned to win soldiers by persuasion and gifts to his own beliefs, —

[146] For another view of this incident cf. p. 222 above.

[147] Cf. Idolol. 19 and P. Franchi de' Cavalieri, Studi e testi, LXV (1935), 357ff. Compare again Tertullian's intransigent attitude about Socrates (Hanfmann, Harv. St. Class. Phil. LX, 1951, 217) and philosophy in general.

[148] Cf. Baynes, Camb. Anc. Hist. XII 659, 663; W. Seston, Mél. Goguel, 239ff. and Historia, I (1950), 257ff; also the Passio Fabii (Anal. Boll. IX, 1890, 123ff., to which Professor A. H. M. Jones drew my attention).

[149] H. Delehaye, Bull. acad. roy. Belg. 1921, 150ff. There is little evidence for Christians in the praetorian guard; cf. M. Durry, Hommages Bidez-Cumont (Coll. Latomus II) 85ff. For their numerical strength in the army under Diocletian, cf. Euseb. H.E. VIII 4.2.

[150] XXVI 85, p. 115 Keil (i 358 Dindorf). Cf. Artemidor, II 31 p. 128.4 Hercher 'the soldier is neither idle nor needy.' (*Contra*, a homily in B. Aubé, Polyeucte, 76 speaks of military life as seeming to most people unpleasing.)

in Libanius' words, 'persuading the hand which was to grasp the spear, to grasp also both libation and incense, so that when weapons were hurtling, there would be the possibility of prayer to those able to stop them.' And even Julian retained Valens and Valentinian in the army when they were willing to resign rather than sacrifice, 'knowing them to be useful to the state.' [151]

Curiously enough we hear hardly anything of military martyrs under Decius, except for individuals who, when present at the trial of a Christian, professed the faith and took the consequences.[152] Of course, the Decian persecution, though sharp, was short, and our records, except for Egypt and Africa, are nothing like as copious as they are for Diocletian. Decius must have been aware of the presence of Christians in military units,[153] but it does look as though soldiers were not required to produce *libelli* and as though no questions were raised. (So it is said that under Hitler people spoke of refugees in the army.) That individuals in a unit were Christians must have been known to their fellows and even to their superiors; further, dedications show that many soldiers of all ranks took their paganism seriously. Yet as soldiers they had the solidarity of which Juvenal speaks [154] and a sensible commander probably had the will and the power to prevent good men under him from being molested; he might see to it that they were not given wholly repugnant duties, e.g. the arresting of fellow-believers. Such episodes as Eusebius describes in H.E. VII 15, when a rival claimant for the rank of centurion denounced the successful candidate (and this under the tolerant regime of

[151] Liban. Orat. XVIII 168; Socrat. IV 1.10 (cf. Alföldi, Conflict of ideas, 10). Constantine adopted a skilful policy, providing leisure for worship on Sunday and a neutral form of prayer for non-Christian soldiers (Eus. V.C. IV 18ff. cf. Sozomen I 8 on his provision for the sacraments). Cf. n.156.

[152] Cf. Euseb. H.E. VI 41.22f.; Acta S. Marinae et S. Christophori, pp. 62, 69 ed. Usener (soldiers who had been sent to make an arrest). The martyrdom of the soldier Polyeuctus is assigned to the time of 'Decius and Valerian' (Aubé, op. cit. 81); but even the text on which the extant homily depends was written much later (Duchesne, Bull. critique, III, 1882, 223 ascribes it to a contemporary of Theodosius or even Arcadius) and Polyeuctus is represented as having torn up an Imperial edict and destroyed images (Aubé 95f.). Minias has been regarded as a military martyr under Decius (A.A.S.S. Oct. XI 415ff.) but the text clearly means 'soldier of Christ' (H. J. Rose, St. mat. storia rel. V, 1929, 231) and is unhistorical (Delehaye, A.A.S.S. Propyl. Dec. 477).

[153] Alföldi, Camb. Anc. Hist. XII 203.

[154] XVI, 20.

Gallienus) and in VI 5.5, when fellow soldiers denounced one who refused to take an oath (under Septimius Severus) must have been rare; [155] the first story, by the way, proves that not only service in general but also service in a position of responsibility was compatible with Christianity.

It may be felt that the evidence for the situation under Decius in the army is defective, but for the fourth century one fact emerges which remains remarkable even when we remember how the composition of the army was changing and the need for troops increasing. It is the relative indifference of the troops to religious changes; H. Muller has drawn attention to this in a most welcome way. The soldiers sang the monotheistic hymn of Licinius or attended the annual ceremony in honor of *deus sanctus Sol* ordained by him; they marched behind a Christian emblem and again saw it temporarily discarded.[156] When Julian did his best to indoctrinate the troops and to create in them a spirit of active paganism, an individual here and there protested and sometimes, but not always (p. 225 above) forfeited his career; yet the troops as a whole respected Julian as a commander and took things as they came. When he died, they did not resent the Christianity of

[155] For the motif of jealousy cf. Delehaye, Saints militaires, 185.22. — The much discussed Acta S. Dasii do not constitute an exception; the saint's existence is not doubted, but I cannot believe that human sacrifice at the Kronia was permitted in a Roman camp; cf. Delehaye, Passions des martyrs, 321ff. and A.A.S.S. Propyl. Dec. 536. St. Weinstock, J. Rom. St. XXXVIII (1948), 41 n.48 has produced evidence to confirm the statement of the Acta as to the length of the festival; perhaps it was a fragment of information which came to the author without any context in time or place.

[156] H. Muller, Christians and Pagans from Constantine to Augustine, I (Pretoria, 1946; we await eagerly the second part). 26, 46, 73f. For the hymn cf. Lactant. Mort. pers. 46; for *sanctus Sol*, Dessau 8940.

For the paganism of the troops led by Constantine against Maxentius cf. Liban. XXX 6; for his attitude toward the praetorian guard, Baynes, J. Rom. St. XXXIX (1949), 173. Zosim. II 29.5 represents Constantine as starting to perform a traditional rite on the Capitol from fear of the soldiers, but the indignation when he desisted was among the Senate and People (cf. Alföldi, Conversion of Constantine, 101f.). Ephraem Syrus tr. S. Euringer (Bibl. d. Kirchenväter XXXVII), 229 speaks of the secret paganism of soldiers of Constantius as accounting for a disaster; it was so to speak an alibi for the emperor and corresponds to Liban. XVIII 167, on the other side (the troops had failed because the gods were not with them). On Julian's soldiers cf. n. 151: Liban. XVIII 166 speaks of his old troops as invoking the gods; cf. Julian Ep. 26, p. 54.6 Bidez and Greg. Naz. Or. IV 64f., P.G. XXXV 585C (stating that many were won over). Yet Augustine, Enarr. in Ps. 124.7 (P.L. XXXVII 1654) strongly suggests that Christian soldiers were not normally under great pressure in his reign.

Jovian as his successor. It does not appear that the question of religion played any part in the choice either of Jovian or of Valentinian, who was in fact proposed by Julian's friend Salutius.[157]

Charlesworth has remarked 'It was easy for people to turn from the emperor's gods to the emperor's God,' [158] and this might be thought to apply with special force to the army. From Aurelian's time the emperor's position was increasingly hedged with the aura of divinity, a process which continued after the triumph of Christianity.[159] The Arch of Galerius and the comment of Vegetius II 5 on the oath taken by recruits 'by God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, and the Emperor's majesty' [160] are alike significant. Yet we must remember the earlier murders of emperors by soldiers and the way in which the military time and again followed a general who rebelled against the ruler of the time; even in 383 the discontented troops in Britain raised Maximus to the purple.[161] If the policies of Constantine or Constans or Julian or Theodosius had excited any such widespread indignation as did Nero's unRoman and undignified conduct or the luxury of Macrinus or Elagabalus,[162] there would have been conspiracy and revolt.

FIDES EXERCITVVM, FIDES MILITVM, CONCORDIA EXERCITVVM and similar legends on coins of an earlier age remind us that such desirable attributes might be lacking. The real situation is revealed by a fine observation of M. L. W. Laistner about Ammianus Marcellinus; 'The ten military harangues in different ways all impress on the reader one outstanding fact —

[157] On Jovian cf. Seeck, Pauly-Wissowa, IX, 2007; on Valentinian, Alföldi, Conflict of Ideas, 11.

[158] J. Rom. St. XXXIII (1943), 8. Cf. von Bülow's Memoirs (E.T.) IV 263. General von Petery, commandant of Spandau under Frederick William IV was a Catholic, his wife a Protestant. When his wife asked him to which church she ought to go on the King's birthday, to the Protestant or the Catholic, the worthy husband answered: 'It doesn't matter which of the two Gods you pray to, Minna, it's all the same, as long as you pray fervently for His Majesty.' This corresponds to the words put in the proconsul's mouth in Passio SS. Scillitanorum 3 (v. Gebhardt 23) *et nos religiosi sumus et simplex est religio nostra et iuramus per genium domini nostri imperatoris et pro salute eius supplicamus.*

[159] Cf. J. Rom. St. XXXVII (1947), 108, 115; G. H. Williams, Norman Anonymous of 1100 A.D. (Harv. Theol. St. XVIII, 1951), 155ff.

[160] Cf. F. J. Dölger, Ant. u. Chr. II (1930), 273ff.

[161] Ensslin, Pauly-Wissowa, XIV 2547.

[162] Cf. Tac. Ann. XV, 67ff. (cf. XIV, 2); Herodian V 2.4ff., 8.2; Dio Cass. LXXX, 17.1; S.H.A. Macrin. 14.1, Heliogab. 10.1, 15.

the ruler's complete dependence for his position on the good-will of his troops. This is not merely the opinion of an ex-soldier, but sober fact.' [163]

The course of history might have been different if the senatorial aristocracy had not been excluded from military command: I say 'might' for at this time their sympathies though largely, were not as a rule fanatically pagan.[164] As it was, the army showed no strong sentiment for or against Christianity. On this point also Ammianus gives invaluable evidence, and he may fairly be taken to represent the superior element among those who did not reach the highest ranks. He was a convinced theist, with his personal likes and dislikes but without bitterness. He believed in a divinity governing the world, just such a divinity as is predicated in the Edict of Milan, the language of which was presumably chosen with a view to the widest possible acceptability. He found Christianity a thing foreign to himself, and yet could speak of the simple life of some bishops outside Rome as commending them to Eternal Deity and to the true worshippers of Deity (XXVII 3.15). His devotion to Julian as a commander did not prevent him from censuring the excessive hecatombs and the undue interest in divination; he regarded Julian's religious belief and practice as not so far off the mark as were those of Constantius, but still off the mark.[165]

At a lower cultural level, the foreigners now prominent in the army, whether powerful commanders like Arbogast or common soldiers, might be pagans, but it was with a barbarian paganism which yielded to Christianity as the religion of the *Kulturvolk*, just as the native cults of the West had earlier donned the garb of Rome. To such men Roman tradition or *vetustas* [166] or the Altar of Victory did not matter, unless by way of conciliating the still

[163] The Greater Roman Historians, 150. Cf. again the realistic remark, *imperatorem esse fortunae est*, ascribed to Constantine in S.H.A. Heliogab. 34.4, and the coins of Gallienus honoring loyal troops (F. Altheim, Niedergang d. alten Welt, II 164).

[164] Cf. J. A. McGeachy, Cl. Phil. XLIV (1949), 225ff.

[165] Cf. W. Ensslin, Klio, Beih. XVI (1923), 48ff., 83ff.

[166] Cf. H. Bloch, Harv. Theol. Rev. XXXVIII (1945), 209, etc.; Baynes, J. Rom. St. XXXVI (1946), 175; U. Knoche, Symbola Coloniensia Iosepho Kroll (1949), 143ff.

influential senatorial aristocracy of Rome.[167] For Theodosius and Nicomachus Flavianus the battle of the Frigidus was a conflict of religion; for their troops in general it can hardly have been such. The *religio Larum*, the old practices of country dwellers, lasted on for a long time; there were fierce conflicts at Gaza and Baalbek and Alexandria and Sufes; [168] but, as a whole, institutional paganism ended 'not with a bang but a whimper.'

(v) Conclusions on the Feriale Duranum

Looking back, we may conclude that the Feriale Duranum does not imply a policy of Romanization as something planned and maintained for the purpose. A regular list of suitable holidays was a natural part of an organized military life and of Augustan policy in general. There was a certain value in uniformity, but individual units had a good deal of liberty of action.[169] While it is not right to think of the old Roman gods as largely superseded in the third century, the Feriale was, at least for units in the Near East and particularly for a *cohors Palmyrenorum*, in part a survival; the Neptunalia perhaps meant to its members little more than did the festivals observed in Campania in 387 A.D.[170] The Feriale was not wholly religious, as we should use the word, nor was it the whole of the soldiers' religion.

IV. POPULAR AWARENESS OF HOLY DAYS

It was a happy thought of Snyder to add his chapter on Public Anniversaries in the Roman Empire (225ff.), which contains one contribution of the first importance, the reconstruction (297ff.)

[167] Cf. Alföldi, Kontorniaten, and Schweizer Münzblätter, II (1951), 57ff., 92ff. May I remark that, for his interpretation of contorniates in general, it is not necessary to find anti-Christian sentiments in all types? For the clash of Senate and emperors cf. Alföldi, A conflict of ideas in the late Roman Empire. Liban. Orat. XXX 33 says 'those who did not dare to deprive Rome of the practice of sacrifice.'

[168] For rustic piety, cf. F. H. Dudden, Life and Times of St. Ambrose, I 244 and Dölger, Ant. u. Chr. VI (1950), 297ff. (Liban. XXX 55 hints that landowners may resist the suppression of all observances); for Sufes cf. Augustine Ep. 50 and Bloch, l.c. 237 n.88. Liban. Ep. 1351 indicates that before Julian's revival, pagan sentiment ran high at Apamea.

[169] Cf. Suet. Tib. 48.2 (the Syrian legions rewarded *quod solae nullam Seiani imaginem inter signa coluissent*); Tac. H. III 24 *orientem solem* (*ita in Suria mos est*) *tertiani salutavere*; p. 200 above on Castellum Dimmidi, etc.

[170] Mommsen, Ges. Schr. VIII 15ff.; Dessau 4918.

of a text from Theveste recording *dies gymnas(iorum) ex test(amento) Corneli Egriliani.*[171] The testator was a military commander who bequeathed money to the town to provide on certain days [*gy*]*mnasia populo publice in thermis*, which probably means oil, etc. The list of days as restored and identified by Snyder includes twelve of the Imperial anniversaries known at Dura and three others. As at Dura, January 1, the Quinquatria, and Natalis urbis were observed; but *votorum nuncupatio*, March 1, Vestalia, and the Salus festival do not appear and Carmentalia, Equirria, ludi Florales and the second day of the ludi Ceriales do. There are also unidentified days, which may belong to local celebrations or to family occasions of interest to the testator.[172] This Theveste text will come near to representing the Feriale of the *colonia*, which may have been initially influenced by military custom. As elsewhere, various Imperial anniversaries were added in the course of time.

Snyder shows also how such anniversaries were on occasions chosen for the making of spontaneous acts of homage and asks how far dated public acts (including some private dedications) are related to the anniversaries of the Roman calendar in general and again to various ancient assertions that certain days were unlucky. He finds that about 58% of the dated acts which he lists belong to days for which some anniversary or other festival is known and that the dislike of particular days is in general confirmed, although there are exceptions and 5 of the days appear in the Theveste list.[173]

Let us consider the first conclusion. Clearly people were aware of Imperial occasions and anniversaries; *hic dies vere mihi festus*

[171] C.I.L. VIII 1859; S. Gsell, Inscr. lat. Algérie, I 3041.

[172] A celebration of the Floralia was natural, but the days identified as Carmentalia and Equirria were perhaps local or personal celebrations which happened to coincide with these occasions in the Roman calendar; we should certainly expect some festival for Liber or the Cereres and perhaps one for Caelestis. Hoey 310, 312 points out that some days were probably omitted for the reason that provision was already made for oil, etc. Cf. Hoey 109 for a benefaction at Gortyn, and B. Laum, Stiftungen, I 88ff., for other foundations to provide oil. Weinstock's criticisms (J. Rom. St. XXXII 129) are to be noted.

[173] Add February 24 in leap-years (Amm. Marc. XXVI 1.7). Against Snyder's view (293) that the Ides of February and March were systematically avoided note C.I.L. VI 31151 (dedication by *equites singulares* on March 15). The *Mundus patet* days (p. 190 above) were not completely avoided.

atras eximet curas.[174] Again, the popularity of Kalends and (save in February and March) of Ides is natural.[175] Further, the dates of important festivals were well-known points in the year [176] and are used by Columella and Pliny to indicate when the farmer must do this or that. It is hardly an accident that we find many dedications to Juppiter on the Ides, traditionally his day.[177] There is one by an aedile to Volkanus on the Volcanalia; [178] there are dedications to Diana on the anniversary of her temple on the Aventine (a well-known day).[179] We have also one certain and one possible

[174] C. III 14.13f.; cf. Dessau 7213.9 *die felicissimo n(atali) Antonini Aug. n(ostri)*. So was a friend's birthday; cf. [Tibull.] IV, 5.

For corporate observances on Imperial days cf. Dess. 3546 (*collegium Silvani* met on birthdays of Domitia and Domitian, upon the occasion of the dedication of Silvanus, and on the Rosalia); C.I.L. VI 9254 (*collegium centonariorum*) and 33885 (*collegium eborariorum*); Dittenberger, Or. gr. inscr. sel. 595 (the Tyrians at Puteoli). D. M. Pippidi, Recherches sur le culte impérial, 109, remarked that Caligula chose the *natalis* of Augustus as the day for Drusilla's consecration (Balsdon, Oxf. Class. Dict. 301, adds 'probably'). Suet. Tib. 58 records that one man was condemned for allowing an honor to be voted to himself in a *colonia* on a day on which honors had been voted to Augustus.

[175] Cf. n.7 and Dessau 8366 (a lighted lamp and incense to be set on a tomb).

[176] Cf. A. H. Salonius, Zur röm. Datierung (Ann. acad. scient. Fennicae, B. XV 10, 1922), 17 for datings by festivals; he quotes no examples later than Livy, but we have at Pompeii *pridie Nonas Capratinas* (C.I.L. IV 1555). Calendars multiplied in the century after the rise of Augustus to power.

[177] April: Ann. épigr. 1921 no. 23.

May: C.I.L. III 5575, 5580, 5690, 14361.

June: Cf. S. Lambrino, Mél. Marouzeau 319ff. (5 texts in 33 years, which clearly establishes a habit).

July: C.I.L. III 10981.

August: C.I.L. XIII 6630.

Sept.: C.I.L. III 7435. Ann. épigr. 1941, no. 116 (restoration but certain).

Oct.: C.I.L. III 3906; Ann. épigr. 1934 no. 73.

Dec.: C.I.L. III 1078, 5187.

Many as are the other deities honored in the Ides, and free as men were to honor Juppiter on any other day — or to name no day in their dedications — this frequency is not fortuitous any more than is the fact that three temples of Juppiter in Rome were dedicated on the Ides (Wissowa, Rel. 114). Nor, again, is XIII, 6630, where Juppiter is coupled by an officer with Apollo and Diana, to whom the same man, with his troops, made a separate offering on the same day (6629); did he not have in mind the anniversary of Diana's famous temple on the Aventine, the code of which served as a pattern in the foundation of temples? (The same man dedicated two undated altars to Juppiter; 6644–5).

[178] Dess. 7111; Gg. Steinmetz, Röm. — germ. Korrespondenzblatt, VII, 1914, 88f. Cf. Dess. 4914 and n.8 above for the way in which this occasion kept its significance.

[179] Cf. n.177; Wissowa, Pauly-Wissowa, V 333 (with other evidence of the day's popularity); Dess. 7212 *cultores Dianae et Antinoi* at Lanuvium met *natali Dianae et collegi*, etc.

dedication of a statue of a Vestal on the Vestalia,[180] one to Mars Augustus and one to Mars Campestris on March 1,[181] and possible echoes of the *natalis Mercurii*.[182] It was surely no chance that the Diocletianic persecution began on the Terminalia-*nomen et omen*; [183] (the suggestion that Constantine chose September 13 for the dedication of a notable church at Jerusalem because it was the *natalis* of the Capitoline Temple is less probable).[184] To return to private individuals, they no doubt often made perishable offerings on the occasion of a festival,[185] just as the Greeks held domestic celebrations in connection with public holy days.[186] Again, a festival may have sometimes suggested inspired private acts of piety shortly after itself — as H. Graillot suggests with reference to *taurobolia* celebrated soon after the great festival of Cybele.[187]

[180] Dess. 4938; C.I.L. VI 31129. Nevertheless, other such statues of Vestals were erected on various different days and, in spite of Snyder 260, we should not connect Dess. 2185 (dedication to Hercules Invictus etc.) and C.I.L. III 11082 (to Victoria Augustorum nn. et leg. I) with the Vestalia.

[181] C.I.L. II 1515, 4083, but on this day we find also dedications to Juppiter Dolichenus, (Ann. épigr. 1940 no. 72) and other dedications (Snyder 270).

[182] On the *natalis Mercurii* we find a *coactor* at Colonia Agrippinensis setting up a dedication which may well have been to Mercurius and perhaps to Maia (Ann. épigr. 1926 no. 19 with A. Oxé, Wien. St. XLVIII, 1930, 54f.), and two men erecting a statue of Bonus Eventus and giving funds for an annual celebration (C.I.L. V 4203; Brescia). This is tenuous, but Mercurius was markedly a patron of merchants (cf. Ov. Fast. V 671ff.), and there may be some conscious thought of the day that was his and theirs.

In Dess. 238 the dedication of *signum Libertatis restitutae* on Oct. 15 during the *ludi Iovi Liberatori* in 68 A.D. is perhaps deliberate in view of the political sentiment of the time; cf. H. Mattingly, B.M.C.R. Emp. I cxcv.

[183] Lactant. Mort. persec. 12, remarking *inquiritur peragendae rei dies aptus et felix*. Cf. Bell. Hisp. 31.8 on the poignancy of a rout which was nearly a disaster *ipsis Liberalibus*: n.8. *Feralibus* in Cic. Att. VIII 14.1 is probably not meant to strike an ominous note.

[184] So A. Baumstark, Reallex. Ant. Chr. II, 91. (That the date was Sept. 13 seems to be certain, in view of H. Usener, Theodosios, 146f.; cf. N. Nilles, Kalendarium, I 274, II 601.). To be sure, after 70 A.D. each Jew was compelled to pay to Juppiter Capitolimus the didrachm which he had contributed to the Temple, and Jerusalem later become Aelia Capitolina. Yet if there had been any such intention, would not there be some reference to it in Euseb. V. Const. or even in Sozomen II 26? Further, was Constantine very conversant with Roman tradition? He is quoted as saying 'My Rome is Sardica' (F.H.G. IV 199) and he did not scruple to enter Rome on the *dies Alliensis* (C.I.L. I, ed. 2, p. 322).

[185] Cf. Hor. C. III 13; cf. Plin. Ep. IX 39.2 (many vows made, many paid on the festival of the Ceres temple on his estate). For a durable dedication made by Emesenes 'on the beautiful day' (Dess. 8882), cf. H. Seyrig, Syria, XIV (1933), 278.

[186] Cf. Harv. Theol. Rev. XXIX (1936), 85n. 165; for Rome, cf. [Tibull.] IV 2.

[187] Le culte de Cybèle, 168. Other possible echoes of the celebration are a dedi-

Yet there were many *taurobolia* at other times of the year and countless acts of sacrifice on days with no special character; such was Galba's sacrifice *pro aede Apollinis*, as described by Tac. Hist. I 27. In general, the making of offerings which aspired to permanence was determined by special occasions, e.g. the *honesta missio* of troops, or again by some supposed divine favor or command (*ex viso*, *iussu*, *imperio*, etc.).

Again, I have not met private dedications which can be associated with the popular Quinquatria, or any by women on March 1, or any to Sol Invictus or an equivalent on December 25, the *Natalis Invicti*. Since votive inscriptions of any kind are rare from the time of Aurelian onwards, this is not as significant as it might be, but it is worth noting. So the *dies Solis* has often been thought to have counted for something in Mithraism, but if you take the dated material and, with H. Lietzmann's Zeitrechnung, translate it into days of the week, you will find no clear preference for Sunday.[188]

Many of the texts which Snyder associates with festivals must be a matter of coincidence (such as Horace records, Carm. III 8). This is surely so with numerous *proskynemata*, expressions of piety inscribed by visitors in sacred or otherwise remarkable places on the days on which they happened to arrive.[189] We cannot safely suppose that a man giving an Egyptian dating was normally aware of its Roman equivalent and even less that he knew the religious associations of that equivalent; the Aboda Zara suggests that the only non-Imperial occasions universally known were the Saturnalia and New Year's Day.[190]

---

cation to the Great Mother on March 27 (C.I.L. VI 30967), a memorial statue erected at Ostia by a high *dendrophorus*, on March 24 (XIV 324), and a dedication made by the cognate *hastiferi* on March 24 (Dess. 7095). The *Megalesia* followed hard upon the dramatic festival and may have provided some supporting influence.

[188] It might be interesting to check whether in other dedications and private acts there was any avoidance of Saturday; cf. F. H. Colson, The Week, 14. On popular interest in knowing the days of the week cf. Dölger, Ant. u. Chr. VI (1941), 202ff.

[189] This is emphasized by the use of the word σήμερον, 'today'; Harv. Theol. Rev. XXVII (1934), 67.

[190] H. Danby, Mishnah, 437. Kal. Ian. is mentioned as such in the calendar of the *hymnodoi* of the Imperial cult at Pergamon (J. v. Prott, Fasti sacri, 56 no. 27 C4, D6; Inscr. gr. res Rom. IV 353) and in the accounts of the temple of Zeus Kapitolios at Arsinoe (Wilcken, Herm. XX, 1885, 432, 455) although each text uses local month-names. For an equation of local and Roman dating in a foundation at Laodicea cf. Mon. As. min. ant. VI 18.

Caution is required even in making inferences from datings in the Latin West. Thus Snyder p. 287 lists four acts on October 11, the Meditrinalia (a festival of the new wine, and sacred to Iuppiter): an honor paid to a benefactor of Ardea, a tablet *ex (h)ostensu(m) deorum*, a dedication to Iuppiter tonans and Hercules Musinus, and one (the date of which is restored) *Genio hor(reorum) n(umeri) Brittonum*. Is not this pure coincidence, and must we not say as much of the one military *diploma* which falls on the same day? [191] A similar conclusion is hardly to be resisted for the Robigalia (Snyder 274) and for the two days of Tubilustrium (Snyder 271, 276). So on various festival days we find dedications to a number of deities other than the one then honored in Rome, and again Mithraic initiations at Rome during the Megalesia (C.I.L. VI 745, 751b, 753) might point to neglect rather than to observance of that festival.

On the whole, I am inclined to suppose that the choice as distinct from the avoidance of particular days, other than anniversaries of living or recently deceased members of the Imperial House, for dedications, etc., was a restricted phenomenon and that individuals and groups acted in accordance with their whims or circumstances.

Snyder's extensive collection of material, although including many private dedications, does not profess to record them in general. Is there perhaps room for a study of the whole body of dated dedications? This would call for several doctoral theses; I venture to offer one provisional observation.

We have in Latin a considerable body of completely dated dedications to gods and Emperors, and a relatively small body of completely dated texts in honor of individual men and women. In Greek, dedications specifying a year — 'in the archonship of x' or 'in the priesthood of x' come to be fairly common; to be sure, the latter may signify not a dating as such, but the fact that the object in question was set in a temple with full authorization and was entitled to remain there.[192] Dedications with a more detailed date are not uncommon in Egypt, Syria and Lydia, but they are

[191] C.I.L. XVI 72.

[192] Cf. G. Naumann, Griech. Weihinschriften (Diss. Halle, 1933). A dedication at Beroea published by J. M. R. Cormack, Ann. Br. Sch. Ath. XLI 105 has *ἐπὶ ἱερέως διὰ βιου*; there can be no idea of a dating here.

extremely rare within the Greek area proper.[193] The sixth book of the Palatine Anthology mentions no dates and no anniversaries except birthdays; the same is true of the inscriptional dedications in verse collected by Cougny. Greek inscriptions in honor of individuals with any date at all are almost unknown before Imperial times; a few emerge then, some with complete datings.[194] One exception is of interest — the gift to Antiochus theos Epiphanes, set up by Philippus in Babylon in 166 B.C.: the special occasion of the king's Charisteria accounts for this unusual record.[195]

The distribution of full datings in Latin is haphazard; thus only about one-third of the tributes to the piety of Vestal virgins discussed in Harv. Theol. Rev. XXIII (1930), 251ff. have this feature. Nevertheless, there is enough evidence to establish a difference between native Greek practice and that of certain other parts of the ancient world.

If we had only the Latin evidence, we might be tempted to think of *Fortuna huiusce diei*.[196] As a formulation, it has no precise Greek equivalent. Yet the Greeks had their lucky and unlucky days, and their concept of *kairos*; further, their drama as a whole turns on the fact that on a single day the destinies of those concerned took a critical turn, a fact to which their tragedy owes so much of its force and concentration. Moreover, *Fortuna huiusce diei* was the deity of a particular temple, founded for a particular occasion; Cicero's comment (Leg. II 28) *nam valet in omnes dies*, shows how far the concept was from being a part of ordinary Roman thinking.

We might again be tempted to think of the Roman observance of *natalis templi* (p. 231 above) which also had no Greek analogy,

[193] The dedication at Priene of a plan of a building gives month and year (Dittenberger, Syll. ed. 3, 1156). Various records at Samothrace of the initiation of Romans give day and month (as well as year) in Latin; there is nothing like this in the Greek records there.

Professor Edson kindly draws my attention to (1) an unpublished dedication with full dating in 69 A.D. by a slave to Dionysus 'in accordance with a (divine) command' in ancient Mygdonia (in Macedonia); (2) to fully dated gifts by owners of slaves to Ma at Edessa (W. Baege, Diss. phil. Hal. XXII i, 113ff.); (3) to a fully dated dedication by a manumitted slave in Macedonia. In (2) and (3) what is involved is the passage from slavery to freedom, and a date is natural.

[194] Cf. G. Gerlach, Griech. Ehreninschriften (Diss. Halle, 1908), 96.

[195] Cf. Dittenberger, Or. gr. inscr. sel. 253; Tarn, Greeks in Bactria and India, 195.

[196] Cf. Wissowa, Religion, 262; Latte, Arch. f. Rel.-Wiss. XXIV (1926), 247; Fr. Altheim, Röm. Religionsgeschichte (ed. 1951), I 109ff.

and of what Michael Grant has called the Roman sense of 'single ritualistic landmarks.' [197] This involved a deeply rooted sentiment, but it does not provide an answer to our question. First, such Roman building inscriptions as we have very seldom give a full dating, and there is none on the boundary stones recording the enlargement of the *pomerium*, where we should certainly have expected it. Secondly, dated votive inscriptions appear only just before the Empire.[198] Thirdly, there is the evidence of the Near East. We have occasional fully dated records by Egyptians of their visits to quarries etc. from the eleventh dynasty onward,[199] as of their visits to the temple of Medinet Habu from the time of the Macedonian conquest; [200] thereafter we find various dated expressions of piety in Greek.[201]

I am inclined to think that the explanation lies in a differing degree of pleasure in autobiographic detail. This was found from

[197] U. Edinburgh Journal, Spring 1949, 240; Parola del Passato XVIII (1951), 219ff.; Roman Anniversary Issues. Cf. the comments of R. A. G. Carson, J. Rom. St. XLI (1951), 174f., and C. H. V. Sutherland, Coinage in Roman Imperial Policy, passim. Note also Dess. 8940 (offerings to be made annually to *deus sanctus Sol* on the day on which his image was consecrated).

[198] For datings cf. C.I.L. VI, 338, 349 (fragmentary: now no year) and (of an altar) Dess. 4907.

The earliest fully dated dedication in Latin which I have found is Dess. 3784, a restored statue of Concordia, with a base, step, and altar at Casinum in 40 B.C. There are earlier official votives by *magistri* which give the year (C.I.L. I, ed. 2, 672ff.; F. Durrbach, Choix d'inscr. de Délos, I, nos. 116.15, 164).

A strong awareness of days is shown by the early *iovilae* (J. Whatmough, Cl. Q. XVI, 1922, 181ff. and Harv. St. Class. Phil. XLII, 1931, 165, 171; R. M. Peterson, Cults of Campania, 329f.; C. Koch. Der röm. Juppiter, 37ff.), but they lie outside the main line of development.

[199] Datings by regnal years are given as early as the 11th dynasty in the graffiti discussed by H. E. Winlock, Am. J. Sem. Lang. LVII (1940), 152, 154 and LVIII (1941), 156 (ib. 154f. one dating a visit as on the occasion of a festival); cf. R. Weill, Rec. inscr. ég. Sinai, 112, 130, 134f. There are prePtolemaic datings with year, month, and day of visits to Hammamat (J. Couyat-P. Montet, Mém. inst. fr. arch. orient. XXXIV, 1912, 10ff.) and of one to Abusir under Rameses II to make offerings (W. Spiegelberg, Rec. Trav. XXVI, 1904, 152f.: a reference which I owe to Professor John A. Wilson).

[200] W. F. Edgerton, Am. J. Sem. Lang. L, 1934, 116: datings are not found here in Roman times.

[201] Cf. B. Kötting, Peregrinatio religiosa (Forsch. z. Volkskunde, XXXIII–V, 1950). Or. gr. inscr. sel. 38 differs from the Abu Simbel inscription in giving month and day (not indeed year) and in striking the religious note 'beside Pan who blesses travel.' For fully dated acts of homage before Roman times cf. ib. 184–6, 188ff. and F. Preisigke-Bilabel-Kiessling, Sammelbuch, 8411; for dated building inscriptions, V. B. Schulman, Hesperia XVI (1947), 269.

of old in Egypt [202] and to some extent in Syria, where it appears in earlier times on the funerary monuments of great personages and at a lower level after the introduction of the Greek language brought a more widespread pleasure in writing.[203] It is familiar that under the Empire Roman epitaphs came to give a degree of personal detail which has little parallel in Greek epitaphs; even the Republic has, as far as the great families were concerned, its pleasure in *elogia*, real or fictitious. From the time when the mercenaries found themselves at Abu Simbel the Greek was minded to leave some mark of his visits to remote places, even as the youth of Thera left their amatory scribbles on the rockface. But the Roman had in a special sense a pleasure in the precise record of an act, as also in the definition of its specific or juridical character.

These remarks are strictly tentative; fashions arise and disappear without admitting of neat logical explanations: [204] but I venture to raise the question whether this difference of habit in dating has a meaning.

SECTION V

Emperors and Gods

We have seen the predominance of Imperial festivals over divine festivals in the Feriale Duranum and at Theveste. As we think of these things and again of Lietzmann's statement (to which there are not many exceptions) that no new temples were

[202] Cf. G. Misch, Hist. of Autobiography, I 20ff.; A. Erman, Rel. Ägypter (ed. 1934), 202; D. Dunham, J. Eg. Arch. XXIV (1938), 1 ff.; J. Janssen, De traditioneele Egyptische Autobiographie voor het nieuwe Rijk, II. In general cf. Gnomon XXI (1949), 224f. on the genesis of the *Ichstil* in religious texts, and note the fully dated Demotic and Greek dream records in Wilcken, Urk. Ptol.-Z. I pp. 351, 353, 359, 365, 370.

[203] From earlier Syria we have the texts on the sarcophagi of the great; later we have Lebas-Waddington 1839 (life of athlete), 2549 (priestly autobiography, discussed by H. Seyrig, Syria, XV, 1934, 159n.4); Ch. Fossey, Bull. Corr. Hell. XXI (1897), 59ff. (servant of the Syrian goddess); A. Alt, Gott d. Väter, 79 (Abedrapsas); Dura-Europos, Rep. VII/VIII 321; J. Lassus, Inventaire archéol. . . . Hama, 134, no. 75. For datings of temples in Syria cf. Lebas-Waddington 2562g (with Seyrig, Ann. hist. phil. orient. VII, 1939–42) and J. Starcky, Palmyre Guide (Mél. Univ. St. Joseph, Beyrouth, XXIV, 1941), 14.

[204] For Rome cf. H. H. Armstrong, U. Mich. Humanistic St. III (1910) 215ff., etc. (e.g., 265 on such dated records as C.I.L. VI 3005 of the performance of a duty

built in western Asia Minor under the Empire except to Emperors,[205] we are bound to ask once more the question: do the Emperors, at least in the third century, overshadow the gods?

The language of the time is often extreme and yet we have, I think, here something quite different from the exaggerated individualism and propaganda of some late Ptolemies and from the exuberant language of an occasional panegyrist.[206] Rather, the deified emperors have the disciplined order of a legally constituted Hall of Fame. So after Marcus Aurelius, deified emperors had not temples of their own but places in the *aedes Divorum*, the only new shrine being that which the young Romulus owed to the fatherly love of Maxentius (*mutatis mutandis*, a parallel to what Cicero planned for Tullia).[207] *Gottesgnadentum* gained strength, but *Gottesgnadentum* postulates gods who give the grace and who preserve the Augusti.[208] It is an oversimplification to deny these things, as it is to discount the naive Christocentric piety of Wilhelm II. So in art, while the emperor is of divine stature, he looks up, and to the gods. Coins tell a clear story: if on one

---

by one of the *vigiles*); R. B. Lattimore, Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs, 16; A. Sizoo, Reallex. Ant. Chr. I 1050ff.

Mommsen, Ges. Schr. IV 250 n.1 remarks that the ability to be silent about personal achievements ended with the Republic. For the Roman taste for solemnity, cf. Fr. Altheim. Röm. Religionsgeschichte, I 207. The detailed realism of Roman portraiture may be *ad rem*. Cf. again in Apul. Met. XI 26 the date for the hero's arrival at Rome.

On the side of caution, two facts may be noted. Round about 318/7 B.C. Athenian decrees start giving month and day in addition to the prytany dating (e.g. Dittenberger, Syll. 317); why? Secondly, as Mr. Colin H. Roberts informs me, full datings of private letters in Egypt are common in Egypt from Augustus to Nero, and there are few before or later, save in letters of soldiers in the second century, A.D.; here again it is hard to imagine an explanation. (Cf. also n. 200.)

[205] Gesch. d. a. Kirche, I 173f.

[206] Cf. Harv. Theol. Rev. XXIX (1936), 86f. (also 80f. for earlier Ptolemaic evidence), Am. J. Phil. LXIII (1942), 219. We should not attach much importance to the fact that kings are sometimes named before gods; there is ascending order as well as descending order. Cf. G. A. Cooke, Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions, 265ff. (two Palmyrene inscriptions with 'lovers of their city and fearers of the gods,' where the accompanying Greek texts have *εὐσεβεῖς καὶ φιλοπάτριδας*).

[207] Cf. Wissowa, Religion, 346f.; Platner-Ashby, Topographical Dictionary of ancient Rome, 153. Since Dio Cassius was a governor's son and himself consul, his coolness about honors for rulers is noteworthy; cf. D. M. Pippidi, Rev. hist. du Sud-est européen, XIX (1942), 407ff. (= Autour de Tibère, 135ff.).

[208] E.g. C.I.L. VIII 2554, *item diis conservatoribus eorum*; and earlier Sen. Clem. I 1.2 *egone ex omnibus mortalibus placui electusque sum, qui in terris deorum vice fungerer?*; Martial XIII 4 (under Domitian); F. Sokolowski, Eos, XLII (1947), 169ff.

RESTITVTORI ORBIS TERRARVM refers to Hadrian, on another his scepter is borne to him by an eagle, and the legend is PROVIDENTIA DEORVM.[209]

What is called *Kaisermystik* implies that it was thought and hoped that the divine acted on a large scale through the power of Rome and its concrete manifestation in individual emperors.

> No one, says Aristides, is so proud of himself that when he hears the mere name (of the ruler) he can keep still; no, he stands up and chants and worships and joins in a twofold prayer, one for the Emperor to the gods, one for those who are his own to the Emperor himself.[210]

Rome and the emperor stood to the *numen deorum* as the Christian church stood to God and Christ. The ideal character of empire as of church was unaffected by human fallibility and mortality; so also the fundamental fact of belief in a divine background is not made null and void by any seemingly extreme expressions in language and art,[211] and at most times it was safe to condemn the behavior of individual rulers or flatterers.

Finally, as I suggested in J. Rom. St. XXXVII (1947), 104, there is perhaps a certain analogy between the cult of the standards and the cult of the Emperor. The standards received much veneration, and to Tacitus and Tertullian alike they appeared to be the special gods of the army.[212] Again, an individual devotee might restore an *excubitorium ad tutel* (*am*) *signor*(*um*) *et imagin*(*um*) *sacrar*(*um*). (C.I.L. III 3526), or make a dedicatory gift *dis militaribus, Genio, Virtuti, Aquilae sanc*(*tae*) *signisque leg. I Ital. Severianae* (Dess. 2295). Yet even such acts are rare, and after all there are no ex-votos to standards, set up after a prayer appeared to have been granted. No homage was too great for these austere embodiments of the professional and personal sanctities of the soldier's task, always inherited and always

[209] B. M. C. R. Emp. III, 418, 417.

[210] xxvi 32 p. 101 Keil (p. 335 Dindorf).

[211] For such expressions, cf. Inscr. gr. res Rom. IV 144. 3f. (Tiberius as 'the greatest of gods'), Alföldi, Röm. Mitt. L (1935), 97f. and Ensslin, Camb. Anc. Hist. XII 356ff., 370; for comments, cf. Last, Am. J. Phil. LXI (1940), 88; Nock, J. Rom. St. XXXVII (1947), 102ff.

[212] Ann. II 17.2 (cf. I 39, 7); Apol. 16; Adv. nat. I 12. For Jewish feelings on this point cf. C. H. Kraeling, Harv. Theol. Rev. XXXV (1942), 263ff.; Dupont-Sommer, Rev. hist. rel. CXXXVII (1950), 134, 159.

bequeathed.[213] Their loss was an ultimate disgrace and any insult to them would no doubt have evoked an indignation seldom aroused by ordinary sacrilege: even the mutineers did not ignore their holiness. Yet they were perishable material objects, to be replaced and not restored, even as the Emperor was a mortal man, destined to give place to a successor who in some sense acquired the impersonality of his exalted rank. If the emperor was called *deus*, this was an honorary predication, ascribing to him a status with no more than the metaphorical and temporary equivalent of the active attributes of deity. Neither standards nor emperors were thought to hear your prayers, as were Juppiter or Aesculapius or even the little local Celtic and Germanic deities or the sacred stones of the Semitic world. The standards were symbols, not divine entities.

Images also shared the name *signa* and were perishable, though exposed to fewer risks and having a relative approximation to permanence.[214] What is more important, they had been dedicated, i.e. made over to the divine personages whom they represented. They had, further, been installed with some element of religious ceremony; they stood for particular deities, and in the popular mind they could easily be identified with them. Images were sometimes credited with the power of working miracles, a standard like other things could at most be the locus of a portent.

The contrast is clear if we turn from the standards to such figures as *Genius centuriae*, *Genius praetorii* etc. Dedications to them also are often purely honorific. Nevertheless unlike the standards they do sometimes receive genuine votives from individual soldiers in gratitude for supposed blessings,[215] in the same way that we have dedications to a Genius *ex viso*, *ex imperio*, *ex voto*.[216] Even in such varied extensions, the term Genius

[213] Cf. Sen. Ep. 95.35. For the analogy between emperor and standards cf. C.I.L. VII, 1030 *G(enio) d(omini) no(stri) et signorum coh. I Vardull(orum) et n(umeri) explorator(um) Brem(eniensium)*, with v. Domaszewski, Westd. Z. XIV (1895), 14f.; the inscription comes from a *praetorium*. Professor Bloch draws my attention to the instructive story in Tac. Ann. I 18.3: even mutineers had a strong feeling for their units and for their standards.

[214] Cf. Julian, Ep. 89, p. 162. 11ff. Bidez as well as Arnob. VI 16.

[215] Cf. L. Cesano in De Ruggiero, Diz. epigr. III 475f.; so from a freedman to the Juno of his former owner, C.I.L. XI 1324.

[216] Thes. l.l. VI 1836.

implied some power which was more than what was seen; and we must allow that when Augustus accepted the worship of his Genius, this was not just a transparent disguise for direct worship of himself.

A Genius or Victoria could be regarded as a supernatural entity (just as Fides, Honor and Mens Bona were well established figures of cult).[217] The standards could not be so regarded, nor could rulers, living or dead.[218] No honors could cause either to be taken seriously for what they were not.

SECTION VI

Conclusions

Let me now summarize these scattered and provisional observations. The Feriale Duranum has proved that one military unit, and probably all military units, performed acts of worship not only on numerous Imperial anniversaries but also on various other festivals. This was the outcome of a special directive, probably due to Augustus, and not of any intrinsic obligation of armies to carry out traditional acts of homage to the state gods. We cannot suppose any deliberate purpose of Romanization by cult or by any other means. Roman policy aimed at *disciplina* and at its civil counterpart. It is significant that Roman troops showed a marked neutrality in the religious conflicts of the third and fourth centuries.

Familiar as were the great festivals, they did not commonly furnish occasions for private dedications. There would seem to be a difference between the Greek world proper, in which dedications giving day, month and year are extremely rare, and the Roman world and certain portions of the Near East which were hellenized late, where dedications so dated are not infrequent. This may be ascribed to a greater interest in recording autobiographic details rather than to any specifically religious factors. The Feriale Duranum and these indications of popular practice show a marked preponderance of Imperial festivals over

[217] Mattingly, Harv. Theol. Rev. XXX (1937), 103ff.

[218] Cf. my forthcoming paper in Aegyptus. Charlesworth drew my attention to Liban. Orat. XVIII 304, on the answering of prayers to the dead Julian (as pagan saint, I think, rather than as dead ruler; I hope to return to the point).

divine festivals; but this does not mean that the Emperors outranked the gods.

Clearly there is room for further study of these topics. Hoey indicated, as is most welcome, his intention to pursue the study of the religion of the Roman army. In the meanwhile, we are much in the debt of Fink, Hoey, Snyder, and of their master Rostovtzeff, to whom the publication of the Feriale is dedicated in a phrase which we may all make our own, *grato animo*.

APPENDIX

'THEMES SON OF MOCIMUS, PRIEST'

The man known to us from this painting reappears as [*sacer*]*dos Themes Mocimi* in a document from the cohort's archive; it is a list of men taking an oath, 'We shall obey orders and at every command we shall be prepared to stand watch at the *signa* of our lord the emperor.' [219] Themes was accordingly a soldier with an official position in the cohort, and, like a centurion and the noncommissioned officers who are listed with him, did duty as part of a Color Guard.

Parallels for such a title are few. Cumont noted at Dura a reference to a 'legionary priest' in a graffito, recording payments or something of the sort, in the temple of Bel at Dura.[220] Hoey drew attention to the priests of two legions and a priest Azizus, who may have been attached to the Emesene archers; they are recorded in an inscription of 323 in Egypt.[221] The meaning of the term is not necessarily the same in all three instances; Ritterling indeed explained it in the last as an equivalent for the well attested *haruspex*,[222] but it may be this is an institution created as part of the attempt in the early fourth century to reinforce paganism.

[219] Yale Classical St. XI (1950), 215, 235. For this watch at the standards cf. Gilliam, Cl. Phil. XLVII (1952), 29f.

[220] Fouilles de Doura-Europos, 376 no. 14; cf. C. B. Welles, Harv. Theol. Rev. XXXIV (1941), 98.

[221] De Ricci, Arch. Pap. II 445 no. 67. Cumont, Rev. hist. rel. LXXII (1915), 161 n.1 suggests that the priest Azizus, mentioned here, may have been attached to the Emesenes who appear in a text. ib. 451 no. 94 (Dessau 8882), dated 315/6 and naming also a high priest, surely a civilian, but not the other priests. Cf. Seyrig, Syria, XIV (1933), 278n.1; Hoey, Trans. Am. Philol. Ass. LXX (1939), 476 n. 102.

[222] Pauly-Wissowa, XII 1406 (this would be parallel to the substitution of *sacerdos* for *aedituus*, accepted p. 252 below). Passerini in De Ruggiero, Diz. epigr. IV 618 regards these priests in Egypt as a concession to the tendencies of the soldateska.

Were the functions of Themes related primarily to the Palmyrene deities? Certainly he is called *hiereus*, just as is an officiating priest in another painting (though *hiereus* there seems to have been followed by something like 'of the god'), and, unlike his fellow-soldiers he carries 'une fleur ou un bouquet de brindilles.' [223] Yet *sacerdos*, by itself, would perhaps have been an inadequate description for a priest of the Palmyrene deities; the official record does not err on the side of brevity.

Cumont indeed says, 'En Occident, on ne connaît pas de *sacerdos legionis*, parce que dans la religion romaine le magistrat, chef des armées, pouvait accomplir lui-même les cérémonies du culte. Il n'en était pas de même en Orient, où seul la prêtrise, la dignité de *kohen*, ou, comme on disait à Palmyre, de *komar*, permettait d'officier, qu' elle fût héréditaire ou résultât d'une ordination. De là l'adjonction d'un aumônier militaire au tribun dans la cohorte que l'un commandait et pour laquelle il offrait des sacrifices à la romaine, mais où l'autre devait accomplir les actes prescrits par la religion sémitique.' [224] Yet, as Gilliam observed,[225] it is the tribune and not the 'priest' who is offering the incense; the act depicted is an ordinary *supplicatio*, needing no special qualification or liturgical competence, and another painting at Dura shows men offering incense without any priestly assistance.[226] Themes is not even standing beside the tribune unless we allow for a distortion of the picture in the interest of frontality (Cumont, 101) in which case he would be standing slightly behind the tribune and on his right. Again, he is not wearing priestly dress; he is further represented as a little shorter than the man next to him in his row.

There is a wider issue involved. We are so familiar with the contrast between the professional clergies of the Near East and the priests who

[223] Cumont, Fouilles, 360; 94 (ib. 127, a private individual who makes an offering holds a similar object).

[224] Ib. 113. G. C. Picard, Castellum Dimmidi, 165ff. interprets the fragments of a fresco as perhaps representing an offering in which a Roman officer and a high Palmyrene priestly dignitary in a purple robe took part. The condition of the remains does not seem to allow of any certainty. Picard 169, n. 126 argues for the reading SAC(erdos) in C.I.L. VIII 2515; but SAG(ittarius) as read — not conjectured — by Wilmanns is confirmed by the accompanying Palmyrene version published by J. B. Chabot, Corp. inscr. Sem. II, iii, 3908. Picard (ibid.) refers to evidence for a priest of Iahribol in the legio III Augusta; but the inscription in question (published by J. Carcopino, Bull. archéol. com. trav. hist. 1920, lxxxviiif. [= Ann. épigr. 1920, no. 35]) gives no indication that the priest in question was attached to the legion. The phrasing of the text, [*cu*]*ltor dei Torhobolis* [*sac*]*erdotium meritus r* (C. thinks *iterum*, which I doubt) *a deo* suggests that this was no professional priest. Professor Carcopino, to whom I am indebted for the reference, kindly informs me that the inscription was found *outside* the camp.

[225] Y.C.S. XI, 236n.114.

[226] Cumont, Fouilles, 122ff., pl. LV: cf. 76ff. pl. XLV.

ministered in most Greek and Roman cults that we are in danger of forgetting that in the Near East also, save in Persia (where the Magi were a clan possessing a general sacerdotal character and privilege), a priest was ordinarily a priest of a particular temple in which he performed certain functions and enjoyed appropriate emoluments; he had a prebend or benefice.[227] Outside his temple a priest had the dignity of his station, and in Egypt and Mesopotamia he belonged to a distinct class within society, but his situation was not like that of a Christian priest, invested by ordination with sacramental powers valid anywhere. The Egyptian king alone had a universal priesthood, the ordinary clergy being theoretically his deputies. As a rule a member of this clergy, like a priest in Mesopotamia, was trained in traditional lore and he was taken into a hierarchy — but it was a local and not a universal hierarchy. Further, despite the existence of certain general patterns, each sanctuary could have its own myths and its own festivals. Even in Judaism, with its massive unity in essentials, the functions of a *kohen* existed only at Jerusalem and Leontopolis; after sacrificial cultus at these places disappeared, the *kohen* had in practice nothing left save precedence and the right to pronounce the benediction, and then, as before, the synagogue's service of prayer and praise and its periodic festivals demanded no hieratic personnel. ('The priest' appears as a title of dignity in Dura Rep. VI 390).

When the conquests of Alexander led to a considerable interchange

[227] Cf. Fouilles 382 for evidence for 'courses' of priests at Dura, just as at Jerusalem. Cf. Dura-Europos, Rep. VII/VIII, 129f. for son succeeding father as priest of some god, apparently a family concern, and herald of the city. On the position of the Magi cf. Am. J. Arch. LIII (1949), 282ff. A priest of one temple in Egypt was occasionally given a position in another; cf. H. Gauthier, Le personnel du dieu Min, 17; J. Vandier, Rel. Eg. (ed. 1), 160 f.; W. Spiegelberg, Abh. Bayer. Ak. N.F.I. (1929), 18, 22 (3d–2d cent. B.C.): W. Otto, Priester u. Tempel, I, 232. There were also pluralists, e.g. Or. gr. inscr. sel. 111; an interesting case, since the holder of these offices for a time (Otto, Pauly-Wissowa VIII, 918), is a soldier from Pergamon. They may have been bestowed upon him as on dignitaries in old Egypt; conceivably he received the revenues of his priestly functions without being responsible for any of the duties. It is perhaps likelier that he bought and then disposed of his priestly positions; for Greeks as owners of such posts, cf. Wilcken, Urk. Ptol.-Z. II p. 7 (which is a warning against any projecting back the rigor of Roman administration into Ptolemaic times). For another pluralist cf. Breccia, Ann. serv. ant. Eg. VIII, 1907, 64ff. The temple of Isis at Philae controlled other neighboring sanctuaries (W. Otto, Priester, I 43), but the 'high priest of Alexandria and of all Egypt' known in Roman times held an office created for administrative convenience. For groupings of priests in a locality cf. Otto, Priester, I 19ff.; C. H. Roberts, J. Eg. Arch. XX (1934), 23. — It is significant that the Gnomon of the Idios Logos gives express permission (§ 85) for the bringing in of priests from another temple (qualified by an adjective which is unfortunately mutilated) to join the processions of temples in which there is a shortage of staff.

of population elements, the special knowledge possessed by men of priestly office or descent (whether real or pretended) was sometimes in evidence. We have noted earlier what Arnuphis as *hierogrammateus* claimed to do for Marcus Aurelius (p. 222) and may recall the story told by Porph. V. Plot. 10: the figure of Zatchlas in Apul. Met. II 28 suggests that magicians sometimes made unwarranted claims to high priestly rank. Three centuries before, Apollonius, in describing the fortunes of the cult of Sarapis on Delos, tells how it was introduced by his ancestor, who was of priestly descent.[228] The phrase is to be noted; it implies knowledge of how Egyptians worshipped, but nothing like ordination as we understand it. The presuppositions resemble those of the inscription at Priene relating to the civic establishment there of the cult of Sarapis and providing not only for a priest but also for an Egyptian assistant;[229] it is an Egyptian, not a specially qualified Egyptian.

Nothing more is implicit in this than in the Roman practice of entrusting for many years to Phrygians those parts of the service of *Mater deum* which were deemed unsuitable for citizens,[230] and their earlier habit of securing Greeks to be priestesses of Ceres [231] and Etruscans to act as *haruspices*. So the Carthaginians, when, in their desire to atone for an act of sacrilege during an invasion of Sicily, they established a cult of Demeter and Kore, assigned the priesthood to their most eminent citizens but also appointed the finest Greek residents to the service of the goddesses.[232]

In these last instances of civic action what was desired was the 'know how' which members of the races worshipping particular deities might be supposed to possess; it was not anything like Holy Orders deriving from Memphis or Alexandria or Pessinus or Syracuse or Henna. For the most part, the initial establishment of Near Eastern cults in Greece as in Italy was due to immigrants, like the Egyptians and Cypriots at Piraeus. The initiative might lie with an individual, like the ancestor of Apollonius on Delos, or Zoilus, who wished to establish a temple of Sarapis in a city in Southwest Asia Minor and who found that a Cnidian had the same desire; [233] the temple might remain a family possession, as it did for long at Delos and again (also

[228] Cf. Nock, Conversion, 50ff. and now Fr. Zucker in Otto, Beitr. z. Hierodulie (Abh. Bayer. Ak. N.F. XXIX, 1950), 74.

[229] Cf. Wilcken, Urk. Ptol.-Z., I 94; L. Robert, Rev. ét. gr. XL (1927), 222.

[230] D. Halic. Ant. R. II 19.3f.; later the official cult was Romanized.

[231] Cic. Balb. 55: each was given citizenship, *ut deos immortalis scientia peregrina et externa, mente domestica et civili precaretur* (cf. Fest. 268. 27 ed. Lindsay).

[232] Diod. Sic. XIV 77; cf. W. S. Ferguson, Harv. Theol. Rev. XXXVII (1944), 119ff.

[233] Conversion, 49f.

for Sarapis) at Laodicea in Syria.[234] The cult might also spring from the action of a group, sometimes with the backing of their original community; such were on Delos the men from Hieropolis who chose one of their number in 128/7 B.C. to be priest of the Syrian goddess.[235] This was a matter of free election to office, just as within a Greek sodality; there was no question of getting a man who had been given by the old local priesthood a charismatic right to exercise a traditional ministry in new lands. Hieropolis had its *galloi*, some of whom went far afield to beg for the temple funds; but they were not the men responsible for the regular cultus and they resembled dervishes rather than priests.

Accordingly, the introduction of such cults had no sacerdotal basis and it was easy for them to be accepted within the framework of ordinary civic worship; the Syrian goddess soon had on Delos, as had earlier Sarapis, a regular priesthood, with an annual term of office; and this was recognition, not secularization. At Rome and Cenchreae, it seems, and perhaps at Pompeii sacerdotal functions became a whole-time occupation, suited to the performance of daily ritual, and the impulse to this development may have come from individual Alexandrians. Yet there is nothing to suggest 'Orders' deriving from Alexandria. Each sanctuary was an independent entity; so in Apul. Met. XI 29 Lucius has to undergo a new initiation at Rome in order to wear an Isiac vestment on festal days. We must suppose that the clergy of such temples were recruited on the spot by apprenticeship and presumably went through various initiatory rites, devised in accordance with such traditions as were known, and that they were assisted in their functions and responsibilities by men like Lucius who went about with head shorn in priestly style and proudly performed in an honorary capacity what had been in

[234] Cf. P. Roussel, Syria, XXIII (1942/3), 21ff.; cf. Wilcken, Festgabe Deissmann, 1ff. and M. Launey, Rech. sur les armées hellénistiques, II 990ff. on the emergence of the Syrian goddess in Hellenistic Egypt.

[235] Inscr. Délos, 2226; cf. E. Will, Ann. arch. de Syrie, I (1951) 59ff. Roussel, Délos, colonie athénienne, 253 n.4 well argues that Hieropolis had asked Athens for permission for her citizens on Delos to build a sanctuary; cf. the continuing interest of Tyre in her people at Puteoli, (G. La Piana, Harv. Theol. Rev. XX, 1927, 256ff.). He also points out (269 f.) the remarkable adaptation of the cult to Greek conditions shown in the attenuation of the taboo on fish — It is noteworthy that the Hypsistos worshippers at Tanais, who almost certainly practised a derivative form of Judaism, had 'priests' (Nilsson, Gesch. gr. Rel. II 637.) Cf. Or. Gr. inscr. sel. 594 (with full date), supplemented by C. C. Torrey, Berytus IX (1948), 45ff. and J.-L. Robert, Rev. ét. gr. LXII (1949), 148, on the bringing of the god of Sarepta to Puteoli; F. Sokolowski, I Congr. ét. class. (1950), 388 on the introduction of Sarapis at Magnesia ad Maeandrum.

Egypt the professional and paid work of *pastophori*.[236] The cult was entirely independent of the Establishment in Egypt, while preserving the Graeco-Egyptian tradition and cherishing externals; Egyptian sculpture was used to decorate shrines; [237] Apuleius even speaks of liturgical books written in hieroglyphic.[238] (We may compare the Babylonian pedigree claimed by Horos in Propertius IV 1).

It is noteworthy that distinguished representatives of the aristocratic pagan reaction of the late fourth century bore the titles *profeta Isidis*, *sacerdos Isidis*, and combined such office with priesthood in other cults.[239] One can understand their lending their services and their prestige to ceremonials, just as Julian liked to perform functions normally left to priests,[240] and they may have received special initiatory rites; but one cannot imagine their trespassing on an area of sacerdotal privilege, for tradition was their battlecry. There must have been many small sanctuaries of Isis in the West, as there were earlier in the Greek world, which did not have the initiations and the daily worship known at Rome and which were served by priests living in their own homes, following secular callings, and capable of holding municipal office, priests in fact comparable with those of the ordinary cults which required only occasional activity.[241]

I have dwelt on the Egyptian cults *in partibus*, since they could here and there assume so specific a character. If we pass to the cult of Juppiter Dolichenus, there is no reason whatsoever to suppose that the priests of whom we read in inscriptions were in any sense professional. The fact that we sometimes find *sacerdotes* of a shrine, as a plurality, and not one *sacerdos*, may reflect the customs of Doliche, and some of the priests recorded were of Syrian origin: [242] but this does not prove any relationship to a Mother Church. Nor again, does the phrase *sub*

[236] Cf. Otto's book cited n. 228; H. Bloch, Harv. Theol. Rev. XXXVIII (1945), 242ff. (on *neokoroi*, who ranked high at Alexandria also). Apul. XI 21.6 *de suo numero* indicates that the priests were a specific group.

[237] Cf. G. Lafaye, Hist. du culte des divinités d'Alexandrie, 218; O. Marucchi, Not. d. scavi, 1904, 118ff. (sculpture and obelisks with new hieroglyphic building inscriptions in Iseum at Beneventum); P. Gauckler, Sanctuaire syrien du Janicule, 187ff. (Pharaonic statue in this shrine, perhaps presented simply as a valuable object of art).

[238] Met. XI 22.8.

[239] Dessau 4413, 4153f.; cf. Bloch, Harv. Theol. Rev. XXXVIII (1945), 232 n. 74.

[240] Amm. Marc. XXII 14.3 *ostentationis gratia vehens licenter pro sacerdotibus sacra.*

[241] Cf. Dessau 4410 (priest of Isis who is *sevir Aug.*), 4406 (one holding another priesthood).

[242] Cf. A. H. Kan, Juppiter Dolichenus, 39f.-Diod. Sic. I 73.5, expanding Herod. II 37, remarks on the single priest as characteristic of Greek cult; it was of Roman also except where a college, like the Fratres Arvales, had responsibility.

sacerdote N, (or *sub sacerdotibus NN*) in inscriptions involve any such submissiveness to priestly authority as Juvenal VI 519ff. might suggest; it dates the dedications in question and shows that they were authorized.[243] As for the comparable cult of Juppiter Optimus Maximus Heliopolitanus, the god of Baalbek, one inscription refers to the *lustrum* of a particular priest[244] and proves that his functions were for a term and not for life.

So in Mithraism there can be no thought of a priesthood drawing its authority from the gorgeous East. Only once do the inscriptions appear to refer to a *magus*, and that is in the acclamation at Dura, *nama* (i. e. 'homage to') *Maximus magus*,[245] where after all we should perhaps read *Magus* and interpret the word as a *signum*, in this instance possibly something like the additional Christian name given at monastic profession (or at the baptism of a convert to Catholicism).[246] To be sure, Tiridates brought Magi to Rome with him and initiated Nero *magicis cenis*, but this was a matter of native Persian ritual, perhaps an adaptation of the ceremonial meal associated with the consecration of a king.[247] For the rest I may refer to J. Rom. St. XXVII (1937), 109f., adding that the *evocatus* and his associates who established the *spel(a)eum* on Andros[248] did so without any specialist aid. They had presumably been initiated elsewhere and were founding a new shrine.

After all, outside Egypt and Syria, what was a priest in the Graeco-Roman world? He could be called a servant of the god, *servus eius*[249] but so were other members (with various titles) of a cult-association, *quos elexit I.O.M. D(olichenus) sibi servire.*[250] A priest's duty was, as

[243] So one is dated *sub scriba* (Dessau 4317); cf. the restoration of a Mithraeum at Dura *sub procuratore* (Rep. VII/VIII 85). On *sub* cf. Wölfflin, Arch. lat. Lex. XII 449; in Dessau 4067 it corresponds to περί. Cf. n. 192 above. In the Dolichenum on the Aventine we have *sub* once (Ann. épigr. 1940 no. 72), *per* thrice (ib. 73, 75f.).

[244] Dessau 4292.

[245] Rep. VII/VIII 120f. no. 859. The difficult graffito, ib. 127 (cf. J. Bidez-F. Cumont, Mages hellénisés, II 155., C. M. Edsman, Ignis divinus, 221) refers to a literary tradition about the Magi. If the figures there represented on either side of a cult-niche are Zoroaster and Ostanes, they come from a similar source; but they may be the *patres* of the community (Cumont, C.R. Ac. Inscr. 1945, 417n.3). *Magos* in A. Ferrua, Il Mitreo sotta la chiesa di Santa Prisca, 29 (Bull. Comm. Arch. LXVIII, 1940, 85) is a very doubtful restoration.

[246] Cf. St. Wikander, Etudes I (cited n. 46), 40: but the acclamation *nama* ('homage to') and the use of *Persa* as the name of a grade of initiation show the preservation of Persian appearances.

[247] Plin. N.H. XXX 17; cf. Plut. Artax. 3.2.

[248] Inscr. gr. XII Supp. 274; Cumont, Mystères (ed. 3) 241.

[249] Ann. épigr. 1933 no. 121.

[250] Dessau 4316.

Zoilus puts it (n. 233) 'to be in charge and to offer sacrifice.'[251] He was concerned with the ceremonial, and yet in Mithraism it was the initiates who had reached the grade of *pater* who raised others through the various ranks. Essentially a priest was the man who in a particular sanctuary performed all such duties as were not specifically assigned to other functionaries. Entry on priestly duties might require some preliminary rite,[252] and occasionally it was thought to result from divine choice; [253] for certain old native cults it was necessary that the priest should belong to a particular hereditary group; but in general priesthood meant function and not charisma. While in some cities of Asia Minor priesthood might be a costly liturgy or public service, it usually involved perquisites as well as responsibilities; and yet, save in some large Isis temples, it can hardly ever have furnished a livelihood.[254]

We saw how the men of Hieropolis on Delos chose one of their number to act as priest; apart from the cult of Cybele in the West, which was a elective municipal office under the nominal control of the *quindecimviri* in Rome, the majority of cults of deities from the Near East were controlled by private guilds, which chose priests as they did other officials. It will be remembered that in the Roman Bacchanalia the office of priestess was held by various matrons in turn, until Paculla Annia changed things, *tamquam deum monitu*.[255] Apart from such a coup d'etat, a group elected someone who appeared to be competent or who was willing to asume responsibilities in return for a quid pro quo, whether of perquisites or of dignity; *et quaestum et disciplinam* in Liv. XXXIX 8.4 is a telling phrase. A priest or priestess of any Greek or Roman cult might give much more of devotion and his or her piety might be thought to promote the public welfare,[256] but the office was primarily a matter of obligations and privileges; as much may be said of priesthood in the Near East, but there it was far more often lifelong and professional.

There was indeed another type of priesthood which must be recognized — that assumed by the individual, who like the ancestor of

[251] Cf. Plaut. Rud. 285 *huius fani sacerdos.*

[252] Cl. Q. XX (1926), 107ff (on *sub iugum intrare*, for which cf. Fasti Archaeologici, III no. 3496; E. Bikerman, Arch. Hist. Droit Oriental V, 1950, 141); Milet I vii 292, no. 203 (priest of the *demos* of the Romans and of Roma); possibly C.I.L. VIII 16759, *sacerdos hoc loco initiatus*; Seyrig, Syria, XXII (1941), 267ff.

[253] Harv. Theol. Rev. XXIII (1930), 254ff.; n. 224 above; Dess. 6149.

[254] So a priest of Dolichenus at Augusta Trajana was a wine merchant (Supp. epigr. gr. III 537; note the 'law and discipline of the priesthood').

[255] Liv. XXXIX 13.8f. Cf. the limited term of hierophants in Pausan. II 14.1.

[256] Cf. Dittenberger, Syll. 765.4; Harv. Theol. Rev. XXIII (1930), 256; L. Robert, Hell. I 10.

Apollonius introduced a cult. Such was presumably the 'high priestess' who made a dedication at Corbridge to the Tyrian Heracles,[257] in piety and by way of self-advertisement to those who could read Greek. The phenomenon was not new; we have only to recall (1) the mother of Aeschines with her band of votaries; (2) the Orpheotelestai; (3) the Dionysiac initiators mentioned in a Ptolemaic edict; [258] (4) the *sacrificuli ac vates* mentioned by Livy; [259] (5) the Syrian prophets of whom Celsus speaks,[260] whether by way of observation or of parody. They might think that they had a vocation, but they neither had nor needed any *Celebret*.

In any event, priests, whether congregationally chosen or so to speak self-ordained, were not part of a comprehensive organization with central control or even with councils or congresses to discuss or settle matters of faith and practice. The jurisdiction of the quindecimviri over municipal priests of Cybele affected their right to wear the appropriate insignia, and this was granted only for the territory of a single community. There was occasional joint action: thus her priests in three communities (together with priests of other cults) took part in a *taurobolium*,[261] and the priests of Juppiter Dolichenus in Lower Pannonia made a joint dedication to their deity on behalf of the Augusti. The second text belongs to the last fifth of the third century, and has been explained as part of the pagan reaction against Christianity or as a loyalistic gesture.[262] In general, the constancy of pattern of Mithraism and other private cults was maintained by individual conformity, like that of philosophic schools.

Soldiers were often pious, but they very seldom appear as holding the

[257] C.I.L. VII p. 97; Richmond. Arch. Ael. IV xxi (1943), 199ff. (Justin XVIII 4.5 suggests that at Tyre Heracles had a priest — or priests — rather than a priestess.) Cf. Cumont, Mus. Cinquantenaire (ed. 2), 160 no. 136 for a 'public highpriestess' obviously self-styled; Juvenal VI 544f. *magna sacerdos arboris* (cf. n. 266). For the low esteem in which such persons might be held, even by those who employed their services, cf. Demosth. XVIII 259.

[258] Cf. C. Cichorius, Röm. Stud. 21ff.; G. Zuntz, Cl. Q. XLIV (1950), 70ff.

[259] XXV 1.8 with Weissenborn — Müller ad loc.

[260] ap. Orig. In Cels. VII 9. The description of the claims and preaching of these prophets is clearly a caricature of Christianity, but Celsus speaks of their performances as taking place inside and outside sanctuaries as well as on begging visits to cities and camps, and he may have known of devotees seized with ecstasy. We know the type from Wen-Amon's story (Ranke in H. Gressmann, Altor. T. z. A.T., ed. 2,72): cf. Paul. Sentent. V 21.1 *vaticinatores, qui se deo plenos adsimulant* and S. H. A. Macrin 3.1.

[261] Dess. 4140.

[262] C.I.L. III 3343, with Alföldi, Archaeologiai Értesitö, III i (1940), 218f. A. makes it very probable that the inscription comes from Aquincum and suggests that the priest of the provincial emperor-cult inspired the action.

title of priest of this or that cult.[263] After all, they were liable to be called to military duty at the time of some ceremony, and, apart from such official rites as the Feriale prescribed, they probably depended for the most part on shrines or associations established outside the limits of the camp proper. The priests of these, or freelances like the Corbridge 'highpriestess' ministered to the religious needs of the troops, as hucksters and entertainers did to their other needs; [264] occasionally they took pains to show their interest in the army or their gratitude to individual soldiers.[265]

What then was the function of Themes the son of Mocimus and of the 'legionary priest' at Dura? I grant that a Palmyrene unit, so called, might have had a special official, but I think it is better to explain the two on the same basis. Now Gilliam has noted that in a slightly earlier record of the cohort there is mention of an *aedituus*, and has remarked, 'It would be natural to assume that he was merely the caretaker or custodian of the *aedicula* were it not for the possibility that he filled the same office as the later *sacerdos*. It is idle to speculate on the basis of the present evidence, but it would be interesting and significant if the office of *aedituus* had been transformed into that of *sacerdos* between some date in the reign of Alexander and A.D. 239.' [266] I should go a

[263] Cf. Hoey, Trans. Am. Philol. Ass. LXX (1939), 471. Ann. épigr. 1927 no. 59 has β ὑπατικοῦ, i.e. *beneficiarius consularis*, as priest of Mithras at Histria, but the β is uncertain, and it may be that the *consularis* himself was priest (cf. A. Stein, Legaten v. Moesien, Diss. Pannon. I xi, 1940, 66). The priest of Juppiter Dolichenus named in C.I.L. VI 31181 (Westd. Zeitschr. XIV, 1895, pl. III 5) was apparently identical with the *exercitator* of the *equites singulares* named ib. 31187 (V. Gardthausen, Or. St. Nöldeke, 851ff.), but we do not know whether he had retired from military duties before assuming his priesthood. In any event, Hoey's general principle is valid.

[264] Cf. App. Iber. 85: Scipio expelled from the camp before Numantia 'all hucksters, prostitutes, soothsayers, and sacrificers, whose services were constantly used by the soldiers since their misfortunes had made them very timid; for the future he forbade the bringing in of any luxuries or any victim prepared for divination.' [This involved a consideration of morale such as Aeneas Tacticus shows when he directs, 10.4, that in a beleaguered city a soothsayer must not make a (divinatory) offering without the presence of a magistrate.]

[265] Cf. C.I.L. XIII 7786.

[266] Gilliam, Y.C.S. XI, 235ff. Cf. again, Hoey, Trans. LXX, 471 n. 74 and M. Durry, Cohortes prétoriennes 321 on Dessau 2090 *antistes sacer(dos) temp(li) Martis castror(um) pr(aetoriorum)*. *Sacerdos* and *antistes* converged in meaning (cf. C.I.L. VI 716; Cumont, Egypte des astrologues, 118 n. 2); since Mars was so often used to signify military might, I suspect that *templum Martis* was a new name for the shrine containing the standards and representations of the Imperial family.

For alternative titles, cf. C.I.L. VIII 2985/6, where *lib(rarius) leg(ionis)* and *cerar(ius) leg(ionis)* are apparently synonymous (on III 14358.2, cf. Pflaum, J. Sav. 1949, 61).

little further, and suggest that *sacerdos* is simply a more highsounding designation for the holder of the same post.

There is indeed one possible objection: if the functions of Themes were so modest, why is he the only person other than the tribune to be described by name and office? This may seem to disprove my thesis; but we must remember the dress of Themes and his place in the scene. Further, while we might imagine a native priest rendering some special assistance to Terentius as Arnuphis did to Marcus Aurelius, is it credible that he should have become a regular soldier and yet retained a special priestly character? [267] I suggest that Themes was something like a sacristan and that he was present at all religious acts to which the standard was brought; his title would make this appropriate. (It is of course possible that he contributed to the cost of the painting.) As for the name *sacerdos*, it suits the manners of an age which took increasing pleasure in the elaboration of honorific appellations.

This view is perhaps confirmed by one detail in the picture itself. The soldiers behind Themes have their hands raised in adoration; his hand is held at a somewhat lower angle, and touches the *vexillum*.[268] It was not for him to stand, like the *vexillarius*, facing the tribune; he held a humbler rank, but he, and probably the 'legionary priest' at Dura,[269] were in their modest way priests of the standards, 'Details guarding the line.'

For *sacerdos* used of a man in a subordinate position, cf. *sacerdos virginum Vestalium* — a freedman (Wissowa, Religion, 483, 519 n. 1). For its loose employment cf. n. 257 above and *septe(m) pii sacerdotes*, of a group in the Sabazius paintings in the catacomb of Praetextatus (C.I.L. VI 142c; Nilsson, Gesch. II 634ff. Abb. 5). Nilsson, Mél. Picard [Rev. Arch 1949] 766 explains this as meaning the most eminent worshippers.

[267] In Wilcken, Chrest. 277 a priest of Soknopaiou Nesos appears also as *arabotoxotes* of the gate; he is not a soldier but a watcher of the toll station (with a title which is a survival; cf. Lesquier, Armée romaine, 427). Like some other local priests (C. Wessely, Denkschr. Wien, XLVII iv, 1902, 67), he had to supplement his official earnings.

[268] In a Mithraic relief from Dura (Rep. VII/VIII 98, pl. XXIX), the upraised elbow of Barnaadath touches the bull, but that is a result of crowding. For the gesture of Themes cf. a Babylonian relief in F. Boll, Kl. Schr. 87 pl. IV 10 (where the priest is however grasping rather than touching the table on which the solar disk rests). It is to be distinguished from touching as a liturgical act, e.g., the touching of Ishtar's hand or of the royal scepter, discussed by M. T. Barrelet and A. Parrot in Studia Mariana [Doc. et Monum. Or. Ant. ed. Albright-De Buck, IV, 1950] 31, 37, or the touching of offerings by the Arval Brethren (for which cf. G. Metzmacher, Jahrb. f. Liturgiewiss. IV, 1924, 9), and again from a suppliant's grasping an altar or an image.

[269] Cf. n. 220.

DEUS PER NATURAM, DEUS PER GRATIAM

A Note on Mediaeval Political Theology

ERNST H. KANTOROWICZ

Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey

Dr. George H. Williams' recent study on The Norman Anonymous of 1100 A.D., published as an extra number of this Review,[1] may be taken as an excuse for delving once more into the highly suggestive pamphlets of this anti-Gregorian royalist. In a paragraph headed *Christus per naturam, Christus per gratiam* Dr. Williams, able and stimulating, discusses the Christology — perhaps we should say: political Christology — of that courageous mediaeval publicist,[2] thereby commendably calling attention to a hitherto somewhat neglected topic: the bearing of Christology on the relationship between Church and State.[3] It is, however, not the christological aspect of the *natura-gratia* problem which will be dealt with in the following pages, but the historical and doxographic sides of it. Dr. Williams, it is true, has indicated the immediate, or possibly immediate, sources of his author's political theories, but it would have exceeded by far the proper tasks of his analysis to trace every theorem back to its origins.[4] Although the building up of an unbroken *catena philologica* is

[1] George H. Williams, The Norman Anonymous of 1100 A.D. (Harvard Theological Studies, XVIII: Issued by the Harvard Theological Review), Cambridge, 1951.

In the present "Note" the discussion of many a problem that might have been interesting and even essential, has been omitted or sidestepped. I have consciously avoided embarking on interrelated problems, all of them subtle and complicated, and have preferred to concentrate on the one question which the title indicates. Besides the obligations acknowledged in the footnotes I wish to thank Professor Harold F. Cherniss for many fruitful conversations, suggestions, and improvements; for similar courtesies my thanks go to Professor Arthur D. Nock and Dr. George H. Williams, both at Harvard, to Professor Ludwig Edelstein, at Johns Hopkins, and Professor Theodor E. Mommsen, at Princeton University.

[2] Williams, 128ff.

[3] See Williams' Foreword, p. vii, for the original title of his doctoral dissertation. Meanwhile Dr. Williams has elaborated this problem in his study "Christology and Church-State Relation in the Fourth Century," Church History, XX, 1951, No. 3, pp. 3–33, No. 4, pp. 3–26, in which he touches also upon the problems discussed in the present "Note."

[4] Williams, 57f, nos. 168ff, has collected the parallels within the writings of his author and has indicated several relevant antecedents.

not intended here either, it may yet prove not quite useless to spread out in the present paper some material, casually collected and perforce incomplete, which might elucidate the adaptation to Christian thought of an axiom of Hellenistic political theory.

* * * * *

The crucial sentence to which Dr. Williams' chapter-heading alludes is found in the tractate *De Romano Pontifice*, but its essence is rendered more concisely in the tractate *De Consecratione Pontificum et Regum* in which the Norman Anonymous puts forth with greatest vigor his ideas about the proportions prevailing between the divine power and the royal power.[5]

"The king's power is the power of God, but it is God's by nature, the king's by grace."[6]

Although a line of distinction has been drawn between divine power and royal power, that clear distinction itself will turn out to be extremely useful for blurring the borderline between divine and royal powers; it will be peculiarly useful to the Anonymous for exalting the king and proving, in the first place, his vicariate of Christ. For the author logically continues:

Also, the king is *Deus et Christus*, but by grace; and whatsoever he does, he does not simply as a man but as one who has been made *Deus et Christus* by grace; and even he who is *Deus et Christus* by nature, does what he does through his vicar through whom vicariously he acts.[7]

[5] Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Libelli de lite, III, 662ff. I shall quote this tractate simply by quoting page and line.

[6] 667,36f: "Potestas enim regis potestas Dei est, Dei quidem est per naturam, regis per gratiam."

[7] 667,37–40; "Unde et rex Deus et Christus est, sed per gratiam, et quicquid facit non homo simpliciter, sed Deus factus et Christus per gratiam facit. Immo ipse, qui natura Deus est et Christus, per vicarium suum hoc facit, per quem vices suas exequitur." For *Deus factus*, see, e.g., Augustine, *De fide et symbolo*, c. 9, PL., XL, 189: "Non enim sunt naturaliter dii, quicumque sunt facti atque conditi ex patre per Filium dono Spiritus sancti." See also Augustine, De civ., X, 1, ed. Hoffmann (CSEL., 40), I, 447: "[Deus] facit suos cultores deos"; also IX, 23, Hoffmann, I, 440f, and below, nos. 19, 65. For *vicarius Christi*, see now, in addition to the standard studies of Harnack and Rivière, also Michele Maccarrone, " 'Vicarius Christi' e 'vicarius Petri' nel periodo patristico," Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia, II, 1948, 1–32, and "Il Papa 'vicarius Christi,' Testi e dottrina del sec. XII al principio del XIV," Miscellanea Paschini, Rome, 1949, II, 1–37.

In a preceding section of the same tractate the author examines the position of kings and priests according to the Old Testament. He quotes (quite traditionally, as will be seen presently) the versicles Exodus,22,28 ("*Diis* non detrahes et principi populi tui non maledices"), and Psalms,81,6 ("Ego dixi: *dii estis*"), in order to conclude that both the anointed king and the anointed priest were through their anointment *dii* or, as he puts it, were *Deus et Christus*. He stresses explicitly that those anointed on earth are *Deus et Christus* not only according to name (*nomen*) but also according to essence (*res*):

Nam nisi rem haberent, falso designarentur hoc nomine (sc. dii et christi).[8]

The anointed participate in the divine name and essence, though not without some restriction; they participate

not by nature but by grace, since only Christ, Son of God and Son of man, owned both (name and essence) by grace as well as by nature. For he is God by nature and deified by none, is holy by nature and sanctified by none. But I said also "by grace" because according to his human nature he is deified and is sanctified by the Father.[9]

Thus enters Christology into the picture only to be carried over, in an unusual fashion, to the royalist theory. For now the Christ-like anointed on earth is, so to speak, bound to receive his two natures, too. At the anointment, says the author, the spirit of the Lord and his deifying power "leaped" into the anointed (*insiliebat in eos*) changing them into different men. In that moment, and from that moment on, they become truly "figure and image" of the God-man (*Christi figura fierent et imago*), inasmuch as the anointed on earth now becomes a *gemina persona*, that is,

one person by nature, the other by grace. . . . In view of one person he is, by nature, an individual man; in view of the other he is, by grace, a Christus, that is a God-man.[10]

[8] 665,17–23.

[9] 665,24ff: ". . . non tamen per naturam, sed per gratiam, quia solus Christus, filius Dei et filius hominis, hoc habet et per gratiam et per naturam." This argument (Christ *deus per gratiam*) has been often discussed in earlier times and has been canvassed also by Peter the Lombard, e.g., *Sententiae*, III, dist. X, passim, PL., CXCII, 777f.

[10] 664,20ff: "Itaque in unoquoque gemina intelligitur fuisse persona, una ex natura, altera ex gratia. . . Una, qua per conditionem naturae ceteris hominibus

To be sure, the author himself has made a leap in his thinking, for the point of reference for nature and grace has changed. In the one case, "nature" is what makes the king equal to all other human beings, whereas "grace," which leaps into him at his anointment, exalts him over all other men and makes him quasi God and Christ. Contrariwise, in the case of the God-man, "nature" indicates the higher order, that of divinity, whereas "grace" refers only to the humbled Christ in human flesh, co-equal with all other men.

That the anointed on earth share also, to some extent, in the divine "nature" is a different matter; for through the New Covenant those anointed become "more certainly and more truly participants of the divine grace and nature." They become "one with God and Christ by the spirit of adoption," they are *dii et christi per adoptionis spiritum*. Again the author has made a leap in his argumentation, and a significant one it is. "Adoption," which has here taken the place of "grace," is normally understood to be accomplished by the baptismal unction. Hence, what in fact was meant to distinguish every Christian and to make every Christian a "king and priest," now has been appropriated as a special privilege of those anointed at the rites of consecration and ordination.[11] In other words, a ritual act which refers to Christians in general, has been reduced to appear as a purely royal and priestly prerogative, a method of twisting which can look back to a long line of ancestors.

The Norman Anonymous, however, prefers to employ his for-

---

congrueret, altera qua per eminentiam deificationis et vim sacramenti cunctis aliis precelleret. In una quippe erat naturaliter individuus homo, in altera per gratiam Christus, id est Deus-homo." This is the mediaeval version of the later Tudor theory of the King's two Bodies (natural and politic); see F. W. Maitland, "The Crown as Corporation," Selected Essays, Cambridge, 1936, 104–127, and my forthcoming study on that subject.

[11] 667,2ff. For the *consortes divinae naturae*, see 2 Peter,1,4. For the baptismal meaning of adoption (cf. Rom.,8,15–23; 9, 4; Gal.,4,5), see L. Wenger, Art. "Adoption," Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, I, 107f (e.g., Hesych: *υἱοθεσία* = *ἅγιον βάπτισμα*), also col. 108, for the Pauline antithesis of Son of God *φύσει* and sons of God *θέσει* (Gal.,4,8: "qui natura non sunt dii"). See, above all, the introductory prayer of the *Benedictio Fontis*: "ad recreandos novos populos, quos tibi fons baptismatis parturit, spiritum adoptionis emitte"; H. A. Wilson, The Gelasian Sacramentary, Oxford, 1894, 84. It should be added that on other occasions the Anonymous uses the idea of adoption in the normal way, that is, referring to all Christians; see Williams, 143ff, and passim.

mula of nature and grace. In the tractate *De Romano Pontifice* he discusses once more the investiture problem and defends the custom according to which the king invests the bishop with the *temporalia*.

> For when the king grants the investiture he is not a layman that grants it, but the *christus Domini*. That is, a *christus Domini* ruling by grace together with him (*per gratiam ei conregnans*) who is *Christus Dominus* by nature. . . . Verily, that *christus per gratiam*, the king, serves the *Christus per naturam*.[12]

Here the king's character of *christus per gratiam* leads not only, as often it does, to a vicariate of Christ [13] but to a "throne-sharing" with the *Christus per naturam* — the king by grace a *synthronos* of the God.

* * * * *

The arguments of the Norman writer may be startling but they are startling only in their application to the Church-State struggle of post-Gregorian Europe and their integration into a complex system and a well-proportioned edifice of mediaeval royalism. Apart from that, his arguments have their set place within a very long tradition.

The special variety of the antithesis of nature and grace as exhibited by the Anonymous is the essential factor of his system. His antithesis is not the customary one which restores man to his original nature and therewith to immortality. This version, of course, forms the theme of Ephesians,2,3–5: "By nature we were children of wrath. . . . But God . . . has quickened us together with Christ: by grace ye are saved." It is the theme also of St. Augustine's treatise *De natura et gratia* and his other anti-Pelagian writings.[14] But it does not describe the antithesis favored by the Norman author. According to *his* version "nature" is not used in the lower sense of something in need of being remedied

[12] 685,42ff; 686,4.

[13] See also 668,39: "Nec puto quod aliquis iustius debeat ea prerogare quam Christus ex natura per Christum ex gratia, sanctus ex natura per sanctum ex gratia." See below, n. 65, for the "throne-sharing" of all men with Christ.

[14] PL., XLIV, 247ff.

and redeemed by "grace." Nature appears as the higher quality (God by nature) and grace as the lower (god by grace).

The views of the Anonymous have antecedents. In an address to the bishops assembled at Ravenna, in 877, Pope John VIII referred to the events of Christmas 875 when he elevated Charles the Bald to the imperial dignity. The pope, for reasons closely connected with the political situation at that time, chose to bestow rather highflown titles upon his protégé. He referred to him as the *christus* whom God anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows (Psalms,44,8; Hebrews,1,9), a prince "constituted by God as saviour of the world" (*a Deo constitutus salvator mundi*),[15] and then explained to what effect God had established Charles as the prince of his people:

ad imitationem . . . veri Regis Christi filii sui . . . , ita ut quod ipse [Christus] possidet per naturam, iste [imperator] consequeretur per gratiam.[16]

Pope John's oration was not to fall into oblivion. It found its place in at least two canonical collections: in that of Anselm of Lucca the earlier redaction of which may fall in the year 1083, and in that of Cardinal Deusdedit, written between 1085 and 1087.[17] Other canonical collections may contain that document, too. At any rate, there is evidence that the address of Pope John VIII was known to two prominent contemporaries of the Norman Anonymous, and it may have attracted the attention of others as well.

The similarity between the address of Pope John and the arguments of the Norman publicist is striking. The papal formula,

[15] For the political situation, see Williams, 58, n. 169; P. E. Schramm, Der König von Frankreich, Weimar, 1939, I, 36ff; and, for the general papal predicaments in that period, F. Engreen, "Pope John the Eighth and the Arabs," Speculum, XX, 1945, 318–330. For the *salvator mundi* title, see Heinrich Linssen, "ΘΕΟΣ ΣΩΤΗΡ: Entwicklung und Verbreitung einer liturgischen Formelgruppe," Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft, VIII, 1928, 32ff, 70f, who however, does not consider the mediaeval ruler epithets. But on *soter* cf. also Nock in The Joy of Study, ed. Sherman E. Johnson, N. Y. 1951, 127ff.

[16] Bouquet, Recueil des Historiens des Gaules, VII, 694ff; Mansi, Concilia, XVII, Appendix, p. 172.

[17] Anselm of Lucca, *Collectio canonum*, I,79, ed. M. Thaner, Innsbruck, 1906–1915, pp. 52f.; PL., CXLIX, 489 (here numbered I, 78); Deusdedit, IV, 92, ed. Victor Wolf von Glanvell, Die Kanonessammlung des Kardinals Deusdedit, Paderborn, 1905, I, 439.

however, is of even greater interest, since two notions, new to us, here make their appearance: (1) the *imitatio* of Christ, the genuine supreme King; and (2) the antithesis of owning (*possidet*) and achieving (*consequeretur*). All that was implicitly expressed by the Norman writer as well; but it is said more powerfully by the pope and it adds some new flavor to the formula contrasting divinity by nature and divinity by grace.[18]

That formula was applied by Pope John VIII to kingship: In imitation of Christ, King eternal and universal, the Carolingian emperor ascended by grace to a dignity which Christ owned by nature. Such reference to kingship was unwarranted by the *natura-gratia* formula taken all by itself. In the Commentary on the Psalms, ascribed probably wrongly to Bede, the same topic appears in connection with the 81st Psalm, as indeed it often does. To the divine title *Deus deorum* (Psalms 81,1, and 49,1) the author remarks:

> [that refers to him] through whom all those who are not gods by nature, but become gods by grace (*per gratiam dii fiunt*), are deified (*deificantur*).
> One is God by nature, many (are gods) by grace; one is born (a God) from the Father's substance, many have become (gods) by his grace.

The distinction between "being God" and "becoming gods," which is equivalent to the papal *possidere-consequi*, is certainly put forth very vigorously. Then the author comments upon *dii estis* (Psalm 81,6),

> that is, ye may be gods if ye will have done what I shall order ye to do. And ye all, without exception, may be "sons of the most High — sons, that is, by adoption, and gods by grace."[19]

The commentator is more cautious than the Norman Anonymous in keeping apart adoption and grace. And he certainly does

[18] Above, n. 7; also 664,19f: ". . . ut in regendo populo Christi Domini figuram vicemque tenerent et in sacramento preferrent imaginem."

[19] *In Psaltorum Librum Exegesis*, LXXXI, PL., XCIII, 924D, 926A; see also, for Psalm 49,1, p.740BC: "Unus namque Deus est per naturam, multi per gratiam; unus natus est ex substantia Patris, multi facti ex eius gratia. . ." The author here draws heavily from Augustine, *Enarratio in Psalmos*, XLIX, 2, PL., XXXVI, 565 (see below, n. 21). For the authorship of the Psalter Exegesis, see M. L. W. Laistner, A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts, Ithaca, N. Y., 1943, 159.

not think of kings.[20] He talks about the baptized as sons of adoption who potentially may become also "gods by grace," provided that they obey the divine commandments. In other words, he talks about Christians in general, about the *justi et deificati*, whereby the "deification" again refers to Man in general.[21]

Nevertheless, the interpretation of *dii* in the restricted sense of kings and princes must have existed and even have been fairly common, as may be gathered from Jerome's Tractates on the Psalms. In his exposition of Psalm 81, Jerome says epigrammatically: *Quod dii sumus, non sumus natura, sed gratia.*[22] And he adds:

God did not say: "I have said: ye are gods" with regard to kings and princes, but to all: to all those to whom I have equally given body, soul, and spirit,[23] I have given also equally divinity and adoption. Equally we all are born, emperors and paupers.

[20] Nor do others; see, e.g., Augustine, *De fide et symbolo*, c. 9 (above, n. 7), and *Enarratio*, XLIX (above, n. 19). Cassiodorus, one of the sources of Pseudo-Bede, says in the *Expositio in Psalterium*, XLIX, 1: "Dii dicuntur homines, qui bonis conversationibus gratiam supernae Majestatis accipiunt. . . Ita ergo filii dicuntur sicut et dii, quia utrumque gratia praestat utique, non natura"; and similarly LXXXI, 6: "(filii) per gratiam utique, non per naturam," since only Christ "proprie dicitur Dei Filius" whereas the others are sons only *κατ' ἀναλογίαν*; PL., LXX, 348D, 594CD. Also Justin Martyr, *Dialogus*, c. 124, ed. E. J. Goodspeed, Die ältesten Apologeten, Göttingen, 1914, 245, stresses the fact that *all* men may become sons of God; to Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.*, III, vi, 1, ed. Harvey, II, 22, those having received the grace of the adoption appear as the "gods." It would be easy to collect similar places in great numbers.

[21] Pseudo-Bede, *In Psalt.*, XLIX, PL., XCIII, 740B: "Deus deorum, id est Deus iustorum, Deus deificatorum. Si enim est iustificans, est et deificans, quia de iustis dictum est: 'Ego dixi: Dii estis.'" The Justification betrays Augustinian ideas; see *Enarratio*, XLIX, 2, PL., XXXVI, 565: "Manifestum est ergo, quia homines dixit deos, ex gratia sua deificatos, non de substantia sua natos. . . Qui autem iustificat, ipse deificat, quia iustificando filios Dei facit."

[22] *Tractatus in Librum Psalmorum*, LXXXI, 1, ed. G. Morin, Anecdota Maredsolana, Maredsou, 1897, III: 2, p. 77; see also Williams, 72, n. 214, who adds a few more places (Augustine, the Glossa ordinaria, etc.) for *dii* as applied to all Christians, an interpretation which was, of course, well known to the Norman Anonymous as well; see Williams, 144f, 146f, passim.

[23] The Pauline trichotomy (1 Thess.,5,23) should be noted; cf. Erich Dinkler, Die Anthropologie Augustins, Stuttgart, 1934, 255ff; also F. E. Brightman, "Soul, Body, Spirit," Journal of Theological Studies, II, 1901, 273ff, for the Eastern liturgies; the trichotomy, however, is found also in the West despite later "emendations"; see, e.g., H. A. Wilson, The Gelasian Sacramentary, Oxford, 1894, 70, in the Benediction of Oil for Anointing the Sick: "tutamentum corporis, animae et spiritus."

Jerome would hardly have bothered to emphasize so strongly the potential deification of all men and to refute a singling out of rulers had there not existed some tendency to interpret (suggested perhaps by Exodus,22,28) the "gods" of the Old Testament as kings and princes. In fact, Eusebius, when discussing the 81st Psalm, thinks of the *θεοί* mentioned therein in terms of *ἡγούμενοι καὶ ἄρχοντες*, and so did others.[24] Even Chrysostom would answer the question "Whom does he call gods in that place?" with "The rulers." [25] Jerome, of course, did not polemize against Eusebius, but against a common opinion, whereas the one man against whom he really struggles throughout, Origen, is far from giving so much as a thought to kings or princes. Origen, who actually seems to have fathered the conventional interpretation of Psalm 81 (contrasting, in that place, the God by nature with the gods by grace), may be likewise responsible for the exegesis of the word "gods" in the sense of "nothing but a name."

To those created by God the *name* [gods] has been conferred, though not by nature, but by grace.

Although they [the gods] are powerful and seem to have been given that *name* by grace, yet none of them is found similar to God in either power or nature.[26]

To expound the term "gods" as a mere name or speech, a *λόγος ψιλός*, was an expedient adopted also by other interpreters. Theodore of Mopsuestia, for example, says very pointedly that

[24] Eusebius, *In Psalmos Commentaria*, LXXXI, PGr., XXIII, 988B; see also XLIX, 2 (col. 433D): The Seventy *θεοὺς ἐκάλεσαν τοὺς τε ἄρχοντας καὶ κρίτας, ὅπερ ἴδιον μόνου Θεοῦ*. For later times see, e.g., Euthymius Zigabenus, PGr., CXXVIII, 853f, with reference to Exod.,22,28. Antonius Melissa, *Loci communes*, II, 3 (al.CLXXIII), PGr., CXXXVI 1020B, apparently reproducing John Chrysostom, interprets Exod.,22,28, in the sense that the "gods" are the "priests" as opposed to the "princes" mentioned in the second half of the versicle; see, however, next note; and, for the great variety of interpretations, the summary by J. J. Reeve, Art. "Gods," International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, Chicago, 1915, II, 1270–1272.

[25] John Chrys., *Expositio in Psalmos*, XLIX, PGr., LV, 240f, who gives as the first meaning of *θεοί* that of princes: *τίνας ἐνταῦθα λέγει θεούς; Τοὺς ἄρχοντας*. He, too, refers to Exod.,22,28, while discussing Ps.,49,1: *Θεὸς θεῶν*.

[26] Origen, *In exodum Homilia VI*, c. 5, ed. Baehrens, I, 196,22f; also *Homilia VIII*, c. 2, Baehrens, I, 200,25. The *nomen* interpretation is applied by others as well (see, e.g., John Chrys., PGr., XLVII, 758f) and may go back, in the last analysis, to the *λεγόμενοι θεοί* of 1 Cor.,8,5.

those styling themselves "gods" do not prevail in the nature of God, but that they have received, merely by grace, the name of god which is a pure matter of speech.[27] And Theodoret of Cyrus explains even more straightforwardly that

> God the creator of all has a divine nature, not the mere name [of God], whereas man has only the name "Image [of God]," but is lacking the thing itself.[28]

The setting over of *ὄνομα* against *πρᾶγμα* in that connection explains why the Norman Anonymous exclaimed almost angrily: "Nisi rem haberent, falso designarentur hoc nomine." [29]

We may neglect here the numerous authors who, in the midst of the christological struggles, used the antithesis of God-by-nature, god-by-grace chiefly to prove that the Second Person of the Trinity was co-equal and consubstantial with the First: the Son, like the Father, was God *φύσει* whereas all others, "be they sons and gods on earth or in heaven," [30] were "gods" only *χάριτι*, or were "sons of God" only *θέσει*, by adoption. This is what Athanasius expounds, time and again, in his Orations against the Arians; [31] and some arguments of John Chrysostom [32] and Cyril of Alexandria [33] have a similar intention. Their purpose is to show

[27] *In evang. Joannis*, X, 35, PGr., LXVI, 760D. See also the *Scholia vetera in Joannem*, X, 34, PGr., CVI, 1260CD, which come very close to Theodore's text. Since in John,10,34, the versicle Ps.,81,6, is quoted most authoritatively by Christ himself, the exegesis of John frequently is concerned with the interpretation of *θεοί*.

[28] Theodoret, *Quaestiones in Genesim*, I, 20, PGr., LXXX, 108A.

[29] Above, n. 8.

[30] Athanasius, *Oratio I*, c. 39, a quotation from 1 Cor.,8,5. (See next note.)

[31] Athanasius applies that antithesis very often; see, e.g., *Contra Arianos Oratio I*, cc. 8, 39; *Oratio II*, cc. 51, 61; *Oratio III*, c. 6, and passim, PGr., XXVI, 29A, 93A, 272C, 273C, 277A, 334A. Some of his definitions are interesting: *Or. I*, 8, the gods by *charis* are set over against Christ, "the true image of the Father's *ousia*"; *Or. I*, 39, the "true and one Son of the true God," who is God, not as a reward for virtue (*μισθὸς ἀρετῆς*), but *φύσει κατ' οὐσίαν*, is distinguished from *πάντες ὅσοι υἱοί [τοῦ Θεοῦ] τε καὶ θεοὶ ἐκλήθησαν, εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς, εἴτε ἐν οὐρανοῖς* (see below, n. 76); *Or. II*, 59, the "Becoming" sons of God by adoption is stressed: *τὸ μὲν γὰρ 'γενέσθαι', διὰ τὸ μὴ φύσει, ἀλλὰ θέσει αὐτοὺς λέγεσθαι υἱούς φησι*; and in the same chapter he contrasts *κατὰ χάριν* with *κατὰ φύσιν*; *Or. II*, 61, he discusses the nature-grace problem with regard to Christ alone who is the Bringer of grace rather than the Son by grace (above, n. 9).

[32] John Chrys., *In Joannem Homilia III* (*al. II*), c. 2, PGr., LIX, 39.

[33] Cyril plays throughout with the *nomen* interpretation (above, nos. 26, 28, 29): men are only "called" gods; see, e.g., *In Psalmum LXXXI*, PGr., LXIX, 1205; *In Joannis Evangelium*, I, c. 10 (to John,1,18), PGr., LXXIII, 179A.B;

that Christ, like the Father, is "God by nature" and that he is the only "Son of God," and that in comparison with the Son's natural divinity and divine sonship the so-called deification of man by grace or man's adoption to sonship of God cannot detract from the uniqueness of the God-man.

We may turn instead to another aspect of the problem, one which has been conjured up in the address of Pope John VIII when he declared: the emperor achieved by grace a dignity *ad imitationem Regis Christi* who was the true King by nature. Without raising as yet the question how *imitatio* entered into that picture, it should be taken, for the present moment, simply as a fact that the very complex cluster of notions connected with *imitatio Dei* or *homo imago Dei* has been linked with the problem of nature and grace; or that, biblically speaking, Psalm 81,6 (*dii estis*), is inextricably conjoined with Genesis,1,26: *Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram.* That combination is fairly illustrated by Cyril of Alexandria, who, in his exegesis of the Fourth Gospel, declares that all men were adopted (by grace) to the likeness of Christ, God by nature, because images are always to the likeness of the archetype.[34]

Cyril, of course, does not speak of kings, he speaks of men in general. On the basis of Genesis,1,26, however, man and king become easily interchangeable. Theodoret of Cyrus, for example, discusses in one of his *Quaestiones* the Genesis verse and asks what it means.[35] Some people, writes Theodoret, seek man's likeness to God in an anthropomorphic conception of the deity; others hold that man's God-likeness should be sought in the sphere of the invisible, of the soul. Philo, who seems to have started within the Greek-speaking world that kind of discussion on Genesis,1,26, had decided in favor of the invisible, the soul.[36] Theodoret, however, declared both opinions wrong. Man is the likeness of God

VII (to John,10,34), PGr., LXXIV, 25C, 32A; see also, for the problem of adoption, I, c. 9 (to John,1,13), PGr., LXXIII, 153f.

[34] Cyril, *In Joannis Ev.*, V, c. 5 (to John,8,42), PGr., LXXIII, 884D, and passim.

[35] Theodoret, *Quaest. in Gen.*, I, 20, PGr., LXXX, 104ff, almost verbatim repeated by Anastasius Sinaita (below, n. 37).

[36] Philo, *De opificio*, 69, Cohn-Wendland, I,23,2ff, in addition to other places; cf. Harry A. Wolfson, Philo, Cambridge 1948, I, 116, 347, passim.

above all with respect to dominion (*κατὰ τὸ ἀρχικόν*), that is, to his lordship over nature:

> Just as God himself has the lordship over all and everything, so he gave man the lordship over the living creatures lacking reason.

In other words, man is the image of God chiefly because he is ruler like God. Theodoret admits other possibilities as well, since the similitude of man with God may result also from imitations of the archetype (*ὡς ἀρχετύπου μιμήματα*). Man, after a limited fashion, is a creator; he too makes images; he rules and judges in imitation of God (*βασιλεύει ἄνθρωπος καὶ κρίνει κατὰ μίμησιν τοῦ θεοῦ*); but man is imperfect in all that because God creates without labor and without time (*δίχα πόνου καὶ χρόνου*), gives life to his images, and is omniscient — all of which is beyond man's abilities. These considerations lead Theodoret to his statement, quoted above, that man has only the "name" of God's image but lacks the essence.

This conclusion apparently did not satisfy Anastasius Sinaita, a most popular seventh-century author, whose influence on late Byzantine and early Russian thought and art has as yet to be studied. In his *Quaestiones* he quotes Theodoret and reproduces the latter's text almost verbatim. However, he deviates where Theodoret declares that man has only the "name" of God's image, and instead connects the idea of man's rulership after the divine model with Psalm 81,6, and says that the kingly men, as marked out by Theodoret, are sometimes called "gods" in Holy Scripture although there is a great difference between those gods and God: "God is God by nature, man by grace." [37] And Anastasius concludes that man is to the likeness of God in view of his intellect, his free will, and his kingly rule. Concerning the emphasis on rulership Anastasius may have followed Diodorus of Tarsus whose interpretation of Genesis,1,26, has been added (probably by a later editor) to Theodoret's exegesis; for Diodorus states quite bluntly:

[37] Anastasius Sinaita, *Quaestiones*, XXIV, PGr., LXXXXIX, 541ff, esp. 544D, 545B. I am much obliged to Professor André Grabar, of Dumbarton Oaks, for calling my attention to this author and his influence on later Byzantine thought.

In what respect is man the image of God? According to his rulership and his power.[38]

This theme is echoed, even more strongly, in the West. The so-called Ambrosiaster, writing in Rome during the pontificate of Pope Damasus (366–384), likewise explains in his *Quaestiones*: "In dominatione imago Dei factus est homo," [39] only to go even a step further in a later Question. Man, writes he, is the image of God for the purpose that One be made quasi Lord on whom all others depend, for

man has the imperium of God, as it were, as his vicar, because every king has the image of God (*habens imperium dei quasi vicarius eius, quia omnis rex dei habet imaginem*).[40]

The oscillation between the notions of man, of man a king, and of royal office could hardly be more irritating than in the case of Ambrosiaster.

At any rate, by building up a doctrine of man's original kingship and of man's essentially royal character those authors come to create a theory fluctuating between *homo imago Dei* and *rex imago Dei.* They are — perhaps with the exception of Ambrosiaster — far from singling out the professional king as the only image of God, but their concept of "man" in general is, like that of Philo,[41] avowedly royal. The idea of man's inner kingship is found everywhere in early Christian literature, and it has been expounded in a truly grand fashion, for example, by Gregory of Nyssa in his vision of man's natural imperial sovereignty, in his

[38] PGr., LXXX, 108CD: Πῶς οὖν Θεοῦ εἰκὼν ὁ ἄνθρωπος; Κατὰ τὸ ἀρχικὸν, κατὰ τὸ ἐξουσιαστικόν. I am grateful to Professor G. B. Ladner for mentioning this place to me. See also, for Chrysostom, above, n. 25; further, Ps. Athanasius, *Quaestiones in Vet. Test.*, LV (to Gen., 1, 26), PGr., XXVIII, 733B: Just as God βασιλεύει, ἄρχει, ἐξουσιάζει in the universe, οὕτω καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἄρχων καὶ βασιλεὺς καθέστηκε πάντων τῶν ἐπιγείων πραγμάτων.

[39] (Ambrosiaster), *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, XLV, 3, ed. Souter (CSEL, 50), 82, 20. See also Williams, 175ff, for the problem *Rex imago Dei, sacerdos Christi.*

[40] Op. cit., CVI, 17, Souter, 243, 12ff. It would be probably worth while to study Ambrosiaster within the framework of the Eastern *Quaestiones* literature, since the similarities are rather remarkable.

[41] See, e.g., Philo, *De opificio*, 148, ed. Cohn-Wendland, I, 51f. The kingliness and godliness of the Sage, who in many respects is comparable to the vision of the kingly man as created originally by God, will not be considered here; see, for some aspects of the problem within the Philonic context, Goodenough, The Politics of Philo Judaeus, New Haven, 1938, esp. 90ff, 98ff, passim, and below, n. 81.

lapidary statement "Where the power of ruling prevails, there prevails the image of God," and in his stirring apostrophe: "Thou art a kingly being, Man" — *ἀρχικὸν εἶ ζῶον, ἄνθρωπε.*[42]

What matters here is only the combination of the antithesis "God-by-nature, god-by-grace" with the broad idea of *homo-rex imago Dei* and of the God-vicariate of the "image." In this respect not only is Ambrosiaster illuminating but so also is a brief remark of Aponius, an author of the fifth century too little explored, who in his commentary on the *Canticum canticorum* observes:

> What Christ is by *nature,* is achieved by those whom . . . he has placed as his vicars, through the *image.*[43]

Aponius thinks in the first place of the apostles, in the second of the apostles' episcopal successors, that is, of Church officers; however, the *religiosissimi reges* appear to him also as "vicars of God." [44] More remarkable is the fact that in Aponius' work we find "grace" replaced by "image," and we may wonder whether his version of the problem centered, as it is, in "image" and "imitation," does not come closer to the original strata than the Christian notion of grace.

It will be appropriate, though at first glance seemingly not fitting, to adduce here that famous christological argument of St. Basil which later, during the controversy on images, was repeated over and over again.[45] Basil, like all the other anti-Arian christological champions, endeavored to demonstrate the oneness of

[42] Gregory Nyss., *De hominis opificio,* 4–5, and *In verba 'faciamus hominem' Oratio I,* in PGr., XLIV, 136f, 264f. For the connections with Philo and Plato, see Harold F. Cherniss, The Platonism of Gregory of Nyssa (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, XI), Berkeley, 1934, 29f. (nos. 43f, p. 75); cf. 82, n. 45.

[43] Aponius, *In Canticum Canticorum,* ed. H. Bottino and J. Martini, Rome, 1843, p. 235 (Lib. XII, *ad Cant.* VIII, 10). In addition to Harnack, "*Vicarii Dei vel Christi* bei Aponius: Ein Beitrag zur Ideengeschichte des Katholizismus," Delbrück-Festschrift, Berlin, 1908, 37–46, see Michele Maccarrone, "*Vicarius Christi* e *Vicarius Petri* nel periodo patristico," 20ff (see above, n. 7). Cf. Williams, 176, n. 586.

[44] Aponius, p. 202 (Lib. X, *ad Cant.* VII, 5).

[45] Basil, *De Spiritu sancto,* c. 45, PGr., XXXII, 149C, and *Homilia XXIV contra Sabellianos,* c. 4, PGr., XXXI, 608A. For the later repetitions of that passage by John of Damascus, see Kenneth M. Setton, Christian Attitude towards the Emperor in the Fourth Century, New York, 1941, 199, n. 9. Basil's comparison has its antecedents in the writings of Athanasius; see next note.

God the Father with God the Son and defeat the opinion that "two Gods" were involved in the orthodox dogma. For that purpose he avails himself, among other arguments, of a comparison with imperial images also, and declares: The emperor and the emperor's image are not two emperors even though the same respects are paid to the image as to the emperor himself;[46] nor, for that matter, are there two Gods, since the identity of the Son, who is the perfect "Image" of the Father, with the divine archetype is absolute and therefore greater than that of the emperor's image with the imperial archetype. For in the emperor's case identity of image and archetype, so far as it goes, is achieved by imitation (*μιμητικῶς*), whereas the identity of the Son with the Father — not "achieved" at all — is one by nature (*φυσικῶς*).[47] We face a new antithesis, that of *physis* and *mimesis*, which presumably was looming at the back of all the theorems discussed in these pages; and it leads directly to the Hellenistic origins of the nature-grace formula.

* * * * *

The "Pythagorean" tractates On Kingship, the fragments of which have been transmitted by Stobaeus, discussed by Goodenough, and re-edited, translated, and commented on by Delatte, were composed probably not earlier than the first or second centuries A.D., which does not preclude reflection of ideas of the

[46] All that is expressed, in essence, already by Athanasius, *Contra Arianos*, III, 5, PGr., XXVI, 332A.B. who (333A) stresses that the oneness of the Son with the Father is *οὐ κατὰ χάριν* but according to the *ousia* of God which here takes the place of *physis*. See, for the survival of the Athanasian argument in Pseudo-Athanasius and John of Damascus, Setton, op. cit., 199, n. 8. The seemingly strange comparison of Christ with the imperial images derives from the concept that Christ was the perfect *image* of the Father, even his *mimetes* (Ignatius, *Ad Philad.*, 7, 2: *μιμητὴς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ*). The comparison with imperial images is found time and again; see, e.g., Sirarpie der Nersessian, "Une apologie des Images au septième siècle," Byzantion, XVII, 1944–45, 60f, for Chrysostom (*In inscriptionem altaris homilia* I, c. 3, PGr., LI, 71f) and for the Armenian tractate on images by Vrt'anes K'ert'ogh (shortly after 600 A.D.); also Gregory Nyss., *De hominis opificio*, 4–5 (above, n. 43), and *De professione Christiana*, PGr., XLVI, 245A, a place to which Professor Werner Jaeger kindly called my attention. The otherwise very useful study of Helmut Kruse, Studien zur offiziellen Geltung des Kaiserbildes im römischen Reich, Paderborn, 1934, is less satisfactory with regard to the Christian problems.

[47] PGr., XXXII, 149C: *ὃ οὖν ἐστιν ἐνταῦθα μιμητικῶς ἡ εἰκὼν, τοῦτο ἐκεῖ φυσικῶς ὁ Υἱός.*

Hellenistic period.[48] One of the fragments goes under the name of Sthenidas of Lokri.[49] The author elaborates the *topos* of the wise king:

> The King must be a wise man, for so he will be an imitator and emulator of the first God.
> He (the God) is the first king and ruler by Nature [and by Being], the king only by Becoming and by Imitation. The one rules in the entire universe, the other on earth; and the one governs and vivifies all things forever, in himself possessing wisdom, the other has only understanding within Time.[50]

The similarity, especially of the central section, with the Christian doctrines is striking. The resemblance of thought would reach identity of thought if we disregard for the present moment the fact that there has been set over against the God and universal King "by nature" a royal demi-god, not "by grace," but by "imitation." We should not forget, however, to what extent the idea of *imitatio* had penetrated the Christian — and Jewish — theories of kingship.[51] Moreover, there is in Sthenidas' parallel-

[48] Stobaeus, IV, vi, 22; vii, 61–64, ed. Hense, IV, pp. 244f, 263–279; Erwin R. Goodenough, "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship," Yale Classical Studies, I, 1928, 55–102; Louis Delatte, Les Traités de la Royauté d'Ecphante, Diotogène et Sthénidas, Liége and Paris, 1942, according to whose edition the texts are quoted here, whereas the English translation follows that of Goodenough. For the date of the texts, see Delatte, 284f, and passim (especially the arguments on pp. 87 and 108f); the date seems to be accepted by the reviewers; see, e.g., M. P. Charlesworth, in Classical Review, LXIII, 1949, 22f; J. S. Morrison, in Journal of Hellenic Studies, LXIX, 1949, 91f; A. D. Nock mentioned some doubts because there is no evidence "that any Gentile read Philo" (see also Charlesworth, p. 23, n. 1).

[49] For the name Sthenidas, see Delatte, 283.

[50] Stobaeus, IV, vii, 63; Delatte, 45f, cf. 56 and 274ff; for "vivifies" (ζωοῖ), see 103f, 107.

[51] Above, n. 16. For the Byzantine emperor as *mimetes* of God and Christ, see Baynes (below, n. 78), who indicates Eusebius as the mediator of those ideas which, however, are found throughout (Agapetos). For the Jewish strand, see the Letter of Aristeas, 188, 210, 281; Goodenough, Politics of Philo, 90ff; see also Nock (below, n. 81), 215: "Jews and Christians alike accepted the philosophical view that the king was the counterpart of God and that it was his duty to imitate the moral excellences of divinity." In general, see Michaelis, Art. "μιμέομαι, μιμητής," in: Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. G. Kittel, Tübingen, 1939, IV, 661–678, who, however, does not consider the ritual *mimesis* of myths (see Sallustius, c. iv, ed. Nock, Cambridge, 1926, p. 8) or the spiritualization of the painter's *mimesis*: the mass-celebrating priest a "painter" imitating the true mass in heaven; see, e.g., R. H. Connolly, The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai, Cambridge, 1909, 46, passim; R. H. Connolly and H. W. Codrington, Two

ogram of divinity and kingship also the remarkable antithesis of Being (*ousia*) and Becoming (*genesis*) which matches the *esse* or *possidere* as opposed to *fieri* and *consequi* in the Christian versions of that thought. The antithesis of *ἀεί* and *ἐν χρόνῳ*, intensifying that of nature and imitation, likewise is reflected in the Christian texts.[52] Moreover, the concept of the royal *dii et christi* and of kings as mediators between God and men is marked out very clearly in all the Pythagorean political tractates. Diotogenes, for example, another Pythagorean, holds that the God-imitating king, who himself is the Animate Law, "has been metamorphosed into a deity among men" — of course not by grace, but by *mimesis*.[53] And Diotogenes resumes also the theme of *physis* and *mimesis* when he contrasts the God, who "by nature" is the best of all things most honored, with the king, who "by imitation" is best on earth and among men.[54]

Other parallels are frequent and suggestive. We are reminded of the Norman Anonymous and his distinction between the king as an ordinary individual man and the king as *Deus et Christus* by grace when we read how Ecphantus, a third Pythagorean, explains the geminate nature of his king:[55]

Commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy, Oxford, 1913, 35, cf. 17; also the Nestorian Order of Baptism, in H. Denzinger, Ritus Orientalium, Würzburg, 1863, I, 336f; Chrysostom, *In Actus Homilia XXX*, 4, PGr., LX, 226–228, where the Holy Spirit is the painter of the truly "imperial" (divine) images.

[52] For *ὡσία* in that place, see Delatte, 45, 270; cf. supra, nos. 31, 46; and for the antithesis of Time and Eternity, above, p. 263 (n. 35).

[53] Delatte, 39,11, and 255; Goodenough, 68. For the kings as Animate Law, see the recent study by Artur Steinwenter, "NOMOΣ EMΨΥΧΟΣ: Zur Geschichte einer politischen Theorie," Anzeiger der Wiener Akademie, LXXXIII, 1946, 250ff, and Delatte, 245ff.

[54] See, for this passage (Stobaeus, IV, vii, 61, Hense, 265, 5), the commentary of Delatte, p. 254.

[55] See above, n. 10. Goodenough, 76; Delatte, 25f, 28 (the passage has been transmitted twice by Stobaeus), and the important commentary, pp. 179ff. Delatte has not made use of the Philonic parallel adduced by Goodenough, Politics (above, n. 41), 99, a Philo fragment transmitted by Antonius Melissa, *Loci communes*, II, c. 2 (al. CIV), PGr., CXXXVI, 1012B: *Τῇ μὲν οὐσίᾳ τοῦ σώματος ἴσος παντὸς ἄνθρώπου ὁ βασιλεὺς, τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ δὲ τοῦ ἀξιώματος ὅμοιός ἐστι τῷ ἐπί πάντων Θεῷ.* This passage is verbatim repeated by the composer of the Russian Laurentian Chronicle, ed. P. Bychkov (3rd ed., Archeographic Commission), St. Petersburg, 1898, p. 351 (ad a.1175), who actually quotes Philo, though he purports to quote Chrysostom, when he writes: "By his earthly nature the Tsar is like all men; by the power of his rank, however, he is like God." I am grateful to Dr. Michael Cherniavsky, at Princeton, for having called my attention to this passage. See also below, n. 72.

On the earth and among us, man has the best nature of all; but more divine is the king who claims the lion's share of the better elements in the common nature.
He is like other men in his tabernacle,[56] inasmuch as he is formed of the same material; but he is fashioned by the supreme Artificer, who in making the king used himself as archetype.

Ecphantus thus establishes also a king of two bodies or two natures, one human and the other god-like — again, not godlike by grace, but by *mimesis*.

In addition to that Ecphantus availed himself of the stratagem to claim for the king exclusively what normally would refer to man in general, a method not dissimilar to that applied by the Norman Anonymous when he represented the ordinary baptismal unction and "adoption" as though it implied a special privilege of his royal and priestly anointed.[57] Ecphantus borrowed the second sentence of the afore-mentioned passage verbatim from another Pythagorean, Eurysus, who was quoted by Clement of Alexandria.[58] But Eurysus, in his Περὶ τύχας, does not talk about kings at all, he talks about man:

Man is like the others (sc. created beings) in his tabernacle, inasmuch as he is formed of the same material (sc. as the animals); but he is fashioned by the supreme Artificer, who in making him (man) used himself as archetype."

In other words, Eurysus said that the Demiurge created *man* to his own image and likeness, a concept for which he may have drawn inspiration from various sources, most likely however from Genesis,1,26.[59] Ecphantus, while taking over that statement ver-

[56] For σκῆνος and its equivalents, rendered by the Vulgate (2 Ptr., 1,13–14) as *tabernaculum* and meaning the dwelling place of the soul, which is the body, see Delatte, 181. The word is used also with regard to the incarnate Christ, e.g., Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, XC, 5, PL., XXXVII, 1163: "In ipso tabernaculo Imperator militavit pro nobis." According to the Acts of the Persian Martyrs, it is used also by King Shapur to designate his own body ("so long as I remain in my tabernacle"); cf. Oskar Braun, Ausgewählte Akten Persischer Märtyrer (Bibl. d. Kirchenväter), Kempten and Munich, 1915, p. 3, where the translator's question-mark may be safely omitted.

[57] Above, n. 11.

[58] Clement, *Stromata*, V, 5, 29; Goodenough, 76, n. 75, gives that parallel, but Delatte, 177ff., discloses its true implications.

[59] Delatte, 179, gives parallels from Timaeus, but believes that Eurysus was inspired by Genesis, 1, 26.

batim, twisted it by changing "animals" into "men," and "man" into "king," and thus adapted Eurysus' statement to the king exclusively, claiming for him alone what had been said of man in general. Stratagems of that kind were rare in classical times when texts were not synonymous with absolute authority; and even the Jewish interlocutor supporting Celsus against the Christian exegesis complains that scores of prophecies had been claimed for Jesus, or by Jesus, which might just as well have been claimed to refer to countless others.[60] This tendency to establish and then to monopolize claims was daily bread in mediaeval thought, when words of the Bible were applied and adapted and turned around as circumstances demanded, on the greatest scale by Joachim of Fiore. More relevant to the present problem is a phrase of Petrus de Vinea, the imperial logothete and court orator, who in his great eulogy on Frederick II praised his emperor as the one *quem supremi manus opificis formavit in hominem.* What he did was merely to twist by a new application Genesis,2,7: *Formavit Deus hominem;* but since Vinea certainly did not want to proffer a truism, he evidently wished to imply that his emperor exclusively and by special privilege had been formed by the hand of the supreme Artificer himself.[61] Or, the most famous example of those twists, 1 Cor.,2,15: *Spiritualis iudicat omnia, et ipse a nemine iudicatur.* By a process, as tortuous as it is revealing, that verse in which St. Paul demonstrates the inner sovereignty of man endowed with the Spirit, supposedly came to mean (and in practice it did mean and still does) that the pope exclusively was that *pneumatikos* to whom the Apostle referred, and that he alone owned, in a forensic sense, the privilege of judging all and being judged by none.[62] This twisting method of "monopolizing by

[60] Origen, *In Celsum*, I, 50, ed. Koetschau, 101, 17.

[61] Huillard-Bréholles, Vie et correspondance de Pierre de la Vigne, Paris, 1865, p. 426, No. 107; see, for a fuller discussion, Kantorowicz, "Kaiser Friedrich II. und das Königsbild des Hellenismus," Varia Variorum: Festgabe für Karl Reinhardt, Munster and Cologne, 1952.

[62] The material has been neatly summed up by Albert Michael Koeniger, "Prima sedes a nemine iudicatur," Beiträge zur Geschichte des christlichen Altertums und der byzantinischen Literatur: Festgabe Albert Ehrhard, Bonn and Leipzig, 1922, 273–300. As usual, the papal maxim finally became a cornerstone of royal absolutism; see, e.g., Salmasius, Defensio regia pro Carolo I., Paris, 1650 (first published in 1649), ch. VI, p. 169: "Rex a nemine iudicari potest nisi a Deo"; and p. 170: ". . . illum proprium (regem esse), qui iudicat de omnibus et a nemine iudicatur."

exclusion" was indeed a very mediaeval method: the office claimed what was valid for man at large. It is a method of putting office above man, indicating at the same time the shift from man to office. The wheel turned full circle only when, with Dante, "Man" himself, or "being Man," became an office.

A related method of twisting, and of changing application, may be observed in view of the *dii* of the Old Testament, and thereby some light will be shed on the *natura-gratia* formula so closely connected with the "gods." Clement of Alexandria, when referring to Psalm 81,6, interprets "gods" as those endowed with *pneuma* or *gnosis*,[63] those who are made perfect and therefore immortal,[64] and he styles those human "gods" the *synthronoi* of the Saviour, ranking them with or after the angels.[65] Occasionally he illustrates the words of the 81st Psalm by quoting Empedocles on the sages that become gods,[66] just as on another occasion he explains man's becoming like unto God by quoting Heraclitus:

[63] *Stromata*, II, xx, 125, 5, and IV, xxiii, 149, 8, Stählin, II, 181, 314; see also *Protrepticos*, XX, 123, Stählin, I, 86, 18.

[64] *Paedagogus*, I, vi, 26, 1, Stählin, I, 105, 22. Immortality is, *per se*, divinity: *εἰ οὖν ἀθάνατος γέγονεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἔσται καὶ θεός* (Hippolytus, *Sermo in sanctam theophaniam*, c. 8, PGr., X, 860A). See G. W. Butterworth, "The Deification of Man in Clement of Alexandria," Journal of Theological Studies, XVII, 1916, 159ff, and in the same volume (257ff) some further notes on the subject by Cuthbert Lattey, who points out that "deification" does not imply polytheism, but sanctifying grace. For the Christian deification in general, see J. Gross, La divinisation du chrétien d'après les pères grecs, Paris, 1938; also M. Lot-Borodine, La doctrine de la déification dans l'église grecque, Revue de l'histoire des religions, CV–CVII, 1932–1933, and the remarks as well as bibliographic notes of A. D. Nock, in: The Journal of Religion, XXXI, 1951, 214f.

[65] Stromata, VII, x, 56, 6, Stählin, III, 41, 24. Lattey (above, n. 64), p. 261, stresses that the usage of the word *synthronos* indicates a connection of Christian deification with Ptolemaic king-worship; the connecting link, however, should be sought in Psalm 109(110),1, a problem which I shall discuss elsewhere on a broader basis. For the equation with angels, see also Friedrich Andres, "Die Engel- und Dämonenlehre des Klemens von Alexandria," Römische Quartalschrift, XXXIV, 1926, 131ff; Williams, 162, n. 548. The idea, widely spread in the East and especially in the early Church, was that Christ himself represented the "God of gods" with regard to deified men ("gods") who shared the throne with him; see, e.g., Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.*, III, vi, 1, ed. Harvey, II, 22; Athanasius, *Contra Arianos*, I, c. 39, PGr., XXVI, 92f. The idea is found also in the West: Augustine, *Enarrat. in Ps.*, XLIX, 1, PL., XXXVI, 565 (with regard to the *dii facti*); Cassiodorus, *Expos. in Ps.*, XLIX, PL., LXX, 348D ("Deus autem deorum est Dominus Christus"). This became finally the generally accepted interpretation, see Peter the Lombard, *Comment. in Ps.*, XLIX, 1, PL., CXCI, 475B.

[66] *Stromata*, IV, xxiii, 149, 8, Stählin, II, 314, 26; Diels, fr. 146.

ἄνθρωποι θεοί, θεοὶ ἄνθρωποι.[67] For Clement the "gods" were exalted (that is, redeemed or saintly) men and angels, which was true for Jerome too and for others as well.[68] Eusebius and others recognized them as rulers and princes. Jerome expressly rejected that idea, and thought rather of all men or at least of all Christians. Theodoret and his predecessors or followers — they depended directly or indirectly on Philo — think of the royal man as Image of God. Rufinus tells a spurious story about Constantine the Great who allegedly addressed the bishops assembled at Nicaea as "gods." [69] Pseudo-Isidorus, in the forged letters of Popes Anacletus, Marcellus, Melchiades, and others, repeats Rufinus' statement, styling the bishops now quasi *ex cathedra* "gods." [70] Finally, Pope Nicholas I allows *dii* to refer to the pope: ". . . pontificem quem constat a pio principe Constantino Deum appellatum, nec posse Deum ab hominibus iudicari manifestum est." Nothing could be more telling than the new twist from the plural *pontifices* to the one Roman Pontiff, and from the "gods" to the one God "who obviously cannot be judged by man." Surely this was "monopolizing by exclusion." [71]

We now see that with the interpretation of *dii* in the sense of

[67] *Paedagogus*, III, i, 2, 1, Stählin, I, 236, 25; Diels, fr. 67.

[68] Jerome, *Commentarioli in Ps.*, LXXXI, 1, ed. G. Morin, Anecdota Maredsolana, III:1, 1895, p. 63: "[dii] angeli sive sancti." See above, n. 20 (Cassiodorus), n. 21 (Pseudo-Bede), n. 65 (Athanasius, Augustine). Augustine prefers to think of men rather than of angels: ". . . non frustra in scripturis sanctis expressius homines nuncupatos deos quam illos inmortales et beatos, quibus nos aequales futuros in resurrectione promittitur." De civ., IX, 23, Hoffmann, I, 440ff; cf. X, 1, and XV, 23, Hoffmann, I, 447, and II, 112.

[69] Rufinus, *Hist. eccl.*, I, 2, PL., XXI, 468. See also Didascalia Apostolorum, II, 34, ed. R. H. Connolly, Oxford, 1929, 96,17ff, for the bishop as king and god.

[70] See the letters of Pseudo-Anaclet, c. xix, Pseudo-Marcellus, c. x, Pseudo-Melchiades, c. xi, ed. Hinschius, Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae, Leipzig, 1863, pp. 76, 228,248, and passim; the places have been collected by Dr. Schafer Williams, Visio aetatis aureae ecclesiae Pseudo-Isidorianae, Ph.D. Diss. (unpubl.), Berkeley, 1951.

[71] Nicolaus I, *Ep.*, 86, PL., CXIX, 961, Mon. Germ. Hist., Epistolae, VI, p. 486, 17ff; cf. Jean Rivière, "Sur l'expression *Papa-Deus* au moyen âge," Miscellanea F. Ehrle, Rome, 1924, II, 279, who correctly refers to Exod.,22,28, and Ps. 81,6, but concludes that Nicholas wished to appear merely as *primus inter pares*. For the principle of monopolizing by exclusion, see Friedrich Heiler, Altkirchliche Autonomie und päpstlicher Zentralismus, Munich, 1941, 270ff, esp. 274f. Gregory the Great (Reg., V, 36, Mon. Germ. Hist., Epistolae, I, 318, 15ff) uses the Rufinus story with reference to priests in general, and Gregory VII, in his letter to Bishop Hermann of Metz (Reg., VIII, 21, ed. Caspar, 553), gives to the story an unmistakably hierarchic tendency.

"anointed on earth" — kings and priests — the Norman Anonymous was in good company, including that of his seventeenth-century opposite number, Bossuet.[72] At any rate, his arguments were based on a very definite and very sound tradition. This is true also with respect to the "God-by-nature, god-by-grace" formula which customarily was connected with the *dii* of the 81st Psalm. The usefulness of that formula for political theory hinged, of course, on the interpretation of *dii* in the sense of kings. That was originally not the case. It is true that the contrast of *physis* and *mimesis*, which in the last analysis is Platonic,[73] was adapted by the Pythagoreans to political theory as a means of harmonizing the state with the cosmos, of attuning men to the king, and the king to God, and thereby also of exalting the king and making him for cosmic reasons as similar as possible to the godhead.[74] The Christian version of the *physis-mimesis* contrast had originally nothing whatever to do with political ideas. The attuning of earth to heaven was achieved by other means, chiefly through the liturgy, whereas the new *physis-charis* formula served different purposes. Origen, who may have introduced that formula to explain those puzzling *dii* of the Old Testament, used the contrast of nature and grace for apologetic ends; and it retained its apologetic character also when applied to christological thought as a defense and weapon against Arians and other heterodox. The formula then served, above all, to demonstrate that Christ was truly "God by nature" and not identical with that plurality of "gods" who, if they were gods at all and not by name only, were Christian "sons of adoption" or "gods by grace." Only

[72] "Vous êtes des Dieux, mais des Dieux de chair et de sang, de boue et de poussière"; quoted by Fritz Hartung, "L'état c'est moi," Historische Zeitschrift, CLXIX, 1949, 20. As Dr. M. Cherniavsky kindly points out to me, the same arguments were used in Russia, around 1500, by the Abbot of the Volokolamsk Monastery, Joseph Sanin, *Illuminator*, c. 16, in: Pravoslavnyi Sobesednik, Kazan, 1857, Parts 3–4, pp. 602f: "You are gods and the sons of the most High. . . God has placed you in his place on his throne, because the Tsar in his nature is like all men, but in his power he is like the supreme God." See above, n. 55.

[73] See Michaelis (above, n. 51), 663ff, also for the increase of the word *μιμέομαι* and its derivatives in the works of Philo; Cherniss (above, n. 42), 62, for the Platonic usage of that figure of speech; and Henry G. Meecham, The Epistle to Diognetus, Manchester, 1949, 143f, for the commonplace character.

[74] See especially the tractate of Diotogenes; Delatte, 37ff (cf. 270ff); Goodenough, 71ff.

through the adaptation of *dii* to a restricted group of men, to kings or bishops, did the *natura-gratia* formula become available also for political theory and political theology.

To summarize, the mediaeval formula of "God by nature, gods by grace," which has been thrown into focus by the twelfth-century Norman royalist, goes back to the Pythagorean or Hellenistic antithesis of "God by *physis*, god by *mimesis*," which the post-classical or late antique philosophers have combined with their theories on kingship. To what extent certain other and older distinctions — *φύσει θεοί* and *θέσει θεοί*, men immortal and gods mortal, man a terrestrial mortal god and god a celestial immortal man [75] — would demand consideration cannot be decided here. The way, however, in which Clement of Alexandria quoted the Heraclitean *ἄνθρωποι θεοὶ, θεοὶ ἄνθρωποι*, and Athanasius, following St. Paul (1 Cor.,8,5), introduced the sons of God and gods *εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς, εἴτε ἐν οὐρανοῖς* allows us to wonder whether those older distinctions, even though expounded in a new non-dialectical and more appropriate fashion, may not have been contributive, too.[76] At any rate, in the antithesis of "God-by-nature, gods-by-grace" we have to recognize the Christian equivalent of at least one aspect of pre-Christian deification, deification by *mimesis*.[77] It is certainly not the only political theorem which survived during the Middle Ages by transference.[78]

The "transference" itself, however, demands a few words of comment. How did the Hellenistic *mimesis* change into the Christian *charis*, or how did *imitatio* enter into the *natura-gratia* scheme? One has to start from the dogmatic truism that man

[75] The relevant places have been collected by Bywater, in his edition of Heraclitus, Oxford, 1877, 26f, and by R. Walzer, Eraclito, Florence, 1939, 101f; see also Carl Langer, "Euhemeros und die Theorie der *φύσει* und *θέσει θεοί*," Angelos, II, 1926, 53ff. As late as the 11th century, the Byzantine emperor is addressed *θεὸς ἐπίγειος*, though *χάριτι* (V. Valdenberg, "Nikoulitza et les historiens contemporains," Byzantion, III, 1927, 97; cf. R. Guilland, "Le droit divin à Byzance," Eos, XLII, 1947, 142, 149), and to Hobbes (Leviathan, c. XVII) the sovereign is a *Deus mortalis*.

[76] Above, nos. 31, 67; cf. n. 11, and below, n. 81.

[77] Hans Joachim Schoeps, Aus frühchristlicher Zeit, Tübingen, 1950, 298f.

[78] Delatte, 152ff; N. H. Baynes, "Eusebius and the Christian Empire," Mélanges Bidez (Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves, II), Brussels, 1934, 13ff; Steinwenter (above, n. 53); also the study mentioned above, n. 61.

achieved his God-likeness and regained his original immortality as "Image of God" through the medium of divine grace, manifested and activated through the Incarnation. Not by his proper nature, but by divine grace does man become like God. Apart from the deification from above, however, it is in man's proper power to become and be like God by imitation of the Godhead, whereby the notion of *mimesis* implies not merely active imitation, but also "ontologically" the Being like to God as the Living Image of the Deity. Hence the two notions of *gratia* and *imitatio*, appearing so often almost interchangeable, are in fact interrelated through the medium of *imago Dei*. Man the Image of God is the fundamental idea which *charis* and *mimesis* have in common and to which they can be reduced. There is hardly a difference between *eikon* and *mimesis*, just as in *charis* the idea of *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ* is included. Gregory of Nyssa's *χριστιανισμός ἐστι τῆς θείας φύσεως μίμησις* [79] is probably the formulation bringing us as close as we can hope to come to determining the transition from imitation to grace.

The difference between *mimesis* of pagan thought and *gratia* of Christian thought remains nevertheless considerable. According to the Hellenistic philosophers it was an act of man's own virtue to become God-like and be the God's perfect imitator; it was an act of purely human effort and human industry: *deorum virtus natura excellit, hominum autem industria*, as Cicero puts it.[80] According to Christian teaching, however, man could not by his proper human power alone, despite his free will, hope to be restored to his divine Being and divine immortality: this was possible by the intervention of grace only, since every natural virtue became of merely relative value without *veri Dei verus cultus*. Even if the possibility of a completely sinless virtuous man were admitted, writes Augustine, this man would yet be without sin, not by his own natural efforts and merits, but by divine grace.[81]

[79] Greg. Nyss., *De professione*, PGr., XLVI, 244C; also 244D; and *In verba* 'faciamus hominem,' Or. I, PGr., XLIV, 273D. Cf. Cherniss, 62.

[80] Cicero, *Topica*, 76; cf. Delatte, 277, also for additional places.

[81] Augustine, De natura et gratia, c. 42(49), PL., XLIV, 271; also De civ., XIV, 13: "Dii enim creati non sua veritate, sed Dei participatione sunt dii. Plus autem appetendo minus est. . . Illud itaque malum, quo, cum sibi homo placet tamquam sit et ipse lumen, avertitur ab eo lumine, quod ei, si placeat, et ipse fit lumen." The idea of grace in connection with imitation and deification is found already in

In other words, the supranatural was interposed between man and his deification. And the supranatural — that is, grace — had to be interposed if redemption were to make sense. It was this antinomy of Classical and Christian attitudes which was overcome when Dante, despite his full recognition of the celestial paradise of grace, unlocked a *paradiso terrestre* to man's proper *virtù*.

---

the Epistle to Diognetus, X,4, ed. Meecham, 86, who in his commentary (p. 134) stresses that "it is the divine grace and initiative that enables men to imitate God." On the other hand, A. D. Nock pointed out that there were many aspects of Christian "imitation of God" and that the purely human efforts towards imitation were considered effective too (Journal of Religion, XXXI, 1951, 214, in his review of Meecham which unfortunately came to my knowledge only after having finished the present study). However, also the pagan antecedents of Christian deification had many aspects. It was the current view of pagan philosophy in the post-classical era that the philosopher or the sage shared, one way or another, the life of the gods either by his nature or by his training (see also above, n. 41). It should be stressed, however, that for Plato the ὁμοίωσις θεῷ existed only κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν (Theaet. 176B) whereas Plotinus, when quoting that passage (Enn.,II,1), omitted the modification and allowed man to become god-like or even god without such restriction (cf. II,6). In that generalization, the Neo-Platonists certainly approximated Christian deification, a fact very strongly felt by Augustine. He fought the *Platonici* on the ground of their failure to make it clear that their immortals were, like good Christians, gods *a summo Deo facti*; for if the Platonists would only admit that their gods were not *per se ipsos beati*, there would be little difference between their teaching and that of the Christians who, in agreement with many passages of Holy Scripture, likewise called their exalted men *dii* (De civ., IX,23). Hence pagan and Christian deification, despite all obvious contrasts, did not appear totally incomparable, and the convergent trends might be exposed in a far more subtle and satisfactory fashion than by the essay of O. Faller, "Griechische Vergottung und christliche Vergöttlichung," Gregorianum, VI, 1925, 426ff. For that purpose the most recent studies on Epicurus should be considered too, since they suggest a fellowship of the sage with the gods by some kind of homogeneity rather than as a result of supreme efforts. Further investigations in that direction might succeed in establishing a new link between pagan god-likeness and Christian deification by grace. See A. H. Armstrong, "The Gods in Plato, Plotinus, Epicurus," Classical Quarterly, XXXII, 1938, 190–196; Norman W. De Witt, "The New Piety of Epicurus," Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, 3rd Ser., XXXVIII, 1944, 79–88.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Christian Influence upon the Ideology of the Taiping Rebellion, 1851–1864. *By Eugene Powers Boardman.* Madison, Wis., University of Wisconsin Press, 1952. 188 p. $2.00.

Galuth Uguelah B'Safruth Yisroel. *By Meyer Waxman.* N. Y., International Publishing Co., 1952. 311 p.

Great Protestant Festivals. *By Clarence Seidenspinner.* N. Y., Schuman, 1952. 148 p. $2.50.

A History of Unitarianism: In Transylvania, England, and America. *By Earl Wilbur Morse.* Cambridge, Harvard, 1952. 518 p. $7.50.

Par le Mouvement de l'Esprit. *Par Clement-Marcel.* Paris, Lethielleux, 1952. 254 p. 630 fr.

Persecution of the Jews in the Roman Empire (300–438). *By James Everett Seaver.* Lawrence, Kan., University of Kansas publications, 1952. 101 p. $2.00.

Petrus; Jünger, Apostel, Märtyrer. *Von Oscar Cullman.* Zürich, Zwingli, 1952. 285 p.

Plotinus and Neoplatonism. *By Philippus Villiers Pistorius.* Cambridge, Bowes & Bowes, 1952. 175 p. 21 s.

Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association . . . April 15 and 16, 1952. *Edited by Charles A. Hart.* Washington, American Catholic Philosophical Association [1952] 232 p.

Théologie Bénédictine. *Par Marie-Alphonse Denis.* Paris, Lethielleux, 1952. 365 fr.

The World in Tune. *By Elizabeth Gray Vining.* Wallingford, Penn., 1952. 32 p. $.35.

Zu Luthers Lehre von Sünde und Rechteertigung. *Von Prof. D. Rud. Hermann.* Tübingen, Mohr, 1952. 67 p. D.M. $3.40.